

THE MONTH

A CATHOLIC MAGAZINE



NO. 570 (NEW SERIES 180) DEC., 1911

CONTENTS

CARDINAL BOURNE.....	<i>By the Editor</i>	561
THE <i>NE TEMERE</i> DECREE	<i>By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith</i>	563
THE ETHICS OF SHOPPING	<i>By Virginia M. Crawford</i>	577
THE SIGN OF THE CROSS.....	<i>By the Rev. Herbert Thurston</i>	586
THE "WORD" OF GOD: PAGAN AND JEWISH BACKGROUND	<i>By the Rev. C. C. Martindale</i>	603
SOME PROBLEMS OF TEMPERANCE REFORM	<i>By the Rev. Joseph Keating</i>	610
GRACECHURCH PAPERS. IV. The Billington Pew ...	<i>By John Ayscough</i>	624
FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.....		638
The Deficiencies of Nature-Study.		
A Catholic Quaker !		
The Unconsecrated Chalice yet again.		
"Catholic " History.		
REVIEWS		646
SHORT NOTICES		661
BOOKS RECEIVED.....		666
SOME FOREIGN REVIEWS		668

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO
LONDON & ONE SHILLING

[Editorial Offices, 31 Farm Street, Berkeley Square, W.]

STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.

1. **Logic.** By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J., formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford. Second Edition. Price 5s.
 2. **First Principles of Knowledge.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J., late Professor of Logic and General Metaphysics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Fourth Edition. Price 5s.
 3. **Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law).** By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., M.A. Lond.; late Professor of Ethics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
 4. **Natural Theology.** By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J., Professor of Natural Theology at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Second Edition. Price 6s. 6d.
 5. **Psychology: Empirical and Rational.** By MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., D.Lit., M.A. Lond. Seventh Edition (Twenty-first to Twenty-fourth Thousand). Price 6s. 6d.
 6. **General Metaphysics.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Second Edition. Price 5s.
 7. **Political Economy.** By CHARLES S. DEVAS, M.A. Oxon. Sometime Examiner in Political Economy at the Royal University of Ireland. Third Edition. Revised and Enlarged. (Tenth to Twelfth Thousand). Price 7s. 6d.
 8. **Theories of Knowledge (Absolutism, Pragmatism, Realism).** By LESLIE J. WALKER, S.J., M.A. Sometime Professor of Philosophy at Stonyhurst College. Price, 9s.
-

LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co., London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta.



Cardinal Bourne.

THOSE who recollect the days of the "Papal Aggression," sixty years ago, and the turmoil created throughout the country by the establishment of Catholic sees with territorial titles, and the elevation of Wiseman to the Cardinalate, cannot fail to be struck by the contrast now presented, when men of all sorts and conditions respectfully welcome our new Cardinal and congratulate him on a dignity which they regard not only as his due for the services he has rendered to the Church, but moreover as an honour to his country.

It is not easy to realize that in 1850 an occasion exactly similar roused England to such a pitch of fury that the Prime Minister himself was moved to pen and publish his unfortunate *Durham Letter*, in which, after dwelling upon the perils menacing our liberties through the policy of Rome, equally insolent and insidious, he went on to declare that as for himself his alarm did not equal his indignation; while at the Lord Mayor's banquet, Lord Chancellor Truro, amid thunders of applause, declared it to be the resolve of our nation to trample the Cardinal's hat underfoot.

But to-day, as is evident, the whole position has been completely changed. Nobody but a few ignorant fanatics can suppose that such ecclesiastical appointments and promotions, at least within the Catholic Church, have any political significance, or are the recompense of other work than that which is necessarily entailed by them. How entirely old misconceptions have disappeared was clearly seen three years ago, when on occasion of the Eucharistic Congress in London Archbishop Bourne had dealings with Lord John Russell's present successor in the premiership. As is well-known, certain noisy Protestant extremists, moved to frenzy by their fear lest a procession of the Blessed Sacrament should be permitted in the streets of the metropolis, in the excess of their religious zeal threatened the authorities with a breach of the peace.

Their clamour embarrassed and disquieted the Government, which had to appeal to the Archbishop to learn what was going to be done. In the correspondence which resulted nothing was more remarkable than the courtesy and respect with which the Premier and Home Secretary treated one whose very title Lord John Russell's Act had made illegal, while on all hands it was acknowledged that with him remained all the honours of the affair, for the dignified attitude, at once firm and conciliatory, which he preserved throughout.

The English people is ever quick to recognize and respect a man, as on this occasion was shown by the universal tribute which its organs rendered to our prelate. And now, as has been said, they join with his own flock in congratulating him on the distinction he has attained. Under his auspices, we confidently trust that the future of the Church in this country will maintain and amplify the sacred and glorious traditions of its past.

“*The Ne Temere Decree.*”

THE latest act in the ultra-Protestant campaign against the *Ne temere* Decree is the meeting held, under the auspices of the Evangelical Alliance, at the Queen's Hall on November 15th. Lord Kinnauld took the chair, and was supported by Mr. H. M. Campbell, M.P., Dr. John Clifford, the Rev. M. Cooksey, of Belfast, the Rev. Dinsdale Young, of Wesley Chapel, City Road, and the Rev. F. Scott Webster, Rector of All Souls, Langham Place. Not a particularly impressive group surely, with the Rector of the church across the road as the sole representative of the National Church, and Dr. John Clifford to show by his personality, and the “high pitch of enthusiasm” he evoked,¹ how largely the movement is being engineered by intolerant fanaticism! Still, they could claim to have received “messages of sympathy with the object of the meeting” from the Bishops of London (whose name was ungratefully “received in some quarters with hisses”), Rochester, Armagh, and Dublin. We are not aware in what terms these messages were conceived; indeed, it is somewhat suspicious that their text was not read. But anyhow the Archbishop of Canterbury sent the following letter, which was doubtless very welcome, and was read publicly.

Any branch of the Church of Christ must clearly have the power of defining the conditions of its own membership, but it is, in my opinion, much to be regretted that by the promulgation of this Decree, and even more by the language which appears to have been used to secure obedience to it, the Roman Catholic Church should introduce confusion into domestic life and give rise to unnecessary and disquieting doubts as to the legal validity of marriages already contracted, or as to the lawful status of persons who may hereafter be married.²

¹ *Daily News* report.

² A letter from the Bishop of Durham, much to the same effect as the Archbishop's, “arrived too late for communication to the meeting,” but was published in the *Times* for November 21st. It abounds in unproved assertions, but offers no further matter for special comment.

We must regret that a prelate whom we respect should have been misled into addressing a meeting so composed, but it is significant that this letter is the one item in the proceedings, "national protest" though they were called, which the *Times*, in its issue of the following day, thought worthy of being reported. This national protest, however, which the *Times* treated so contemptuously, issued in some indignant resolutions, the first of which "repudiated the pretensions of the Church of Rome to regulate the conditions determining the validity of marriages legally solemnized between British subjects in any part of His Majesty's dominions," and another urged the Government "to take steps to give relief to those suffering from the social consequences of the decree."

We have not yet seen a detailed report of the proceedings, and so cannot say for certain whether any attempt was made to lay before the meeting a definite and authenticated account of the provisions of the Decree against which its denunciations were directed. Apparently no such attempt at accurate explanation was deemed necessary, any more than it was thought necessary to explain to the Government what sort of measures, legal or otherwise, it might take with any hope of success.

The explanation which these gentlemen neglected to give we will try to give in their stead, not with any hopes of causing the light to penetrate the thick curtains of their bigotry, but for the information of any rational persons who may be taken in by their mystifications. It is true that the subject has been often explained before, but it is one which will need to be explained many times over, in an age when people read so much but think so superficially and remember so little. For one thing we thank the Archbishop of Canterbury, for he has called attention to the important distinction between the action of the Church in "defining the conditions of its own membership," and "the language which appears to have been used to secure obedience to it." We thank him for drawing this distinction, though the first term of it is not very correctly stated, and we cannot think the implication contained in its second term to be just. If by the "language used to secure obedience to it" his Grace refers to language used by responsible prelates and writers to announce the character of the new discipline and explain its practical

bearings, surely he would find it hard to bring forward a pastoral letter or expository article which has not been calm and lucid, grave and conciliatory, in its style. If he refers to the language used, or alleged to have been used, by individual persons in their endeavours to get some transgressor who has involved himself or herself in an ecclesiastically invalid marriage to return to the path of grace, we have no wish to defend all that may have been said or done, or may be alleged to have been said or done, by such persons in a zeal which was possibly not according to knowledge. Take, for instance—as the McCann case is stale, and besides has broken down—the case reported from the *Belfast News Letter* in the *Globe* for November 14th. How far it is authentic we cannot say, and on the face of it it is absolutely one-sided. We shall probably be safe in discounting very largely the details with which it is adorned. Still, it is the sort of thing that can happen. A Mission is being given in a Catholic parish, and a zealous endeavour is made to bring back to the sacraments those who have been backsliders. A father comes to say that his daughter has lately married a Protestant in a Protestant church, perhaps even a man who has been divorced from a previous wife still living. Cannot the Mission Father come and see her? She was always a good girl, possibly a Child of Mary, till this man got hold of her and fascinated her. Her parents are sure she has the faith still in her, and that she longs to get right with God. She only wants a little encouragement. The priest goes with the father to see the girl. He appeals to her conscience, and points out to her, what indeed she herself knows well, that, not being married to the man in the eyes of God, she is simply living in sin. Then, seeing that she is moved, he explains to her that she will probably not need to separate from him altogether, now that she has thus allied herself with him and lived with him. But let her go back to her parents for a short while, until her partner can be induced to give satisfaction to her conscience by going through the Catholic form of marriage, for their access to which the priest will strive to obtain every facility. The girl resolves to try the plan and leaves the house with her father. But the man comes after her and terrorizes her, as a man can so often terrorize a girl, till she is prepared to say and sign whatever he dictates to her. If this should be what happened in the recent South Tyrone case, who shall blame the priest for his

action? If, however, we are to suppose that the account given by the *Belfast News Letter* is accurate in every particular, then one must allow that the priest, though inspired with good intentions, acted imprudently and unjustifiably. He should have remembered that in cases of that kind—and there are many such, alas! which come under a priest's notice in the course of his ministry—his true course was to say to the father, "It is very sad, and one pities the poor girl. But she has made her bed and she must lie in it, till she is prepared to take the initiative herself, and insist that the man shall do her justice by going through the Catholic form of marriage." This is what would be the true course for the priest to take in the face of such a tragedy to one whom perhaps he has known and spiritually tended from her happy childhood; and this is what the Church authorities would wish him to do. But no legislation, Papal, Episcopal, or Parliamentary, can ensure that none of the officials appointed to administer it shall ever be guilty of imprudences.

Let us then leave this aspect of the *Ne temere* question alone, as tending only to obscure the true issue, and let us consider whether the *Ne temere* legislation can be justified in itself—that is from the standpoint which the Catholic Church must always keep in view.

(1) In pursuing the stages which have led on to this most recent legislation, we must start from the position that the Catholic Church, the Church of which the successors of St. Peter are the supreme visible rulers, is the one and only true Church of God, to which belongs the office of legislating for the spiritual welfare of all who have been baptized into its fold. Protestants may dispute our right to take up this position, but they must recognize that we do take it up, and are not likely to recede from it; also that the action of the Holy See in its administration, must be based upon this claim, and be the logical outcome of it.

(2) According to Catholic doctrine, marriage—that is to say, the marriage of baptized persons—is a sacrament, the otherwise natural contract of marriage which has prevailed from the beginning having been elevated by the Founder of the Christian Church to the dignity of a sacrament. As such it comes under the guardianship and legislative power of the supreme authority in the Church, as much as does any other of the Seven Sacraments. That the Catholic Church makes claim

to this guardianship of the Sacrament of Matrimony every one knows, and all who know anything about the subject, know that it is a guardianship she will never surrender to the State, still less to any schismatic communion. Again we must say it, others may dispute her right to take up this position, but they cannot dispute that she does take it up, and that she will face the direst persecutions rather than recede from it.

(3) The Church has always held that the essence of marriage—that is, of the form by which the married state is entered—is that of a contract by which each party expresses, externally as well as interiorly, consent to take the other as wife or husband for life. This much is ordained by the very nature of things, but, as the contract thus made is a social contract, having far-reaching social effects, like every other social contract, it comes under the control of the ruler of the society to which it belongs, and hence, as that society in the case of the Sacrament of Marriage is the Church Catholic, it appertains to the supreme ruler of the Catholic Church to impose regulations whereby the nature and object of this contract, as ordained by God, may be the better preserved.

(4) Of the legislation with this intent which the Catholic Church has originated and enforced two points only need occupy us at present, the legislation concerning clandestinity and the legislation concerning diriment impediments, in other words the legislation by which she has sought to secure (1) that the marriages of her children shall be performed only in presence of her own ministers, and in conformity with the ceremonial form she has herself sanctioned, and (2) that these marriages shall be between those only who are not precluded by impediments imposed by divine law, or by ecclesiastical laws which she herself has instituted to supplement it—as, for instance, by a previous marriage still subsisting, by a too close consanguinity or affinity or spiritual relationship, or by a pressure incompatible with freedom of consent inflicted by one person on the other.

(5) As it is at this point that the conflict between Church and State arises, in those countries where the State refuses to recognize the claims of the Church, we may notice here that the State, in such places makes exactly the same claims for herself as we have seen that the Church makes. It claims that, marriage being a contract with important social bearings, it belongs to the State to regulate it, and, in the discharge of

this office, to suppress clandestinity and require the avoidance of certain prohibitions by its authority imposed, such as, in addition to some of those already mentioned, are the performance of the ceremony elsewhere than in the presence of its appointed officials, or without previous compliance with its rules of previous proclamation, or, if the parties be of royal blood, without the previous consent of the Sovereign; or, on the other hand, to regulate it by abolishing the divinely prescribed impediment of absolute indissolubility and sanctioning the re-marriage, after divorce, of those whose previous partners are still living. The Church, in regard to these counter-claims of the State, by the necessity of her position makes a distinction. She cordially recognizes the right of the State to regulate the civil effects of matrimony, such as the descent of property, the acquirement of State rights or privileges, by exacting compliance with its forms. But she denies the right of the State to touch the essence of Christian marriage by making the attempt, which she knows to be in God's eye perfectly vain, to disregard impediments which the Church has imposed, or to impose impediments which the Church has not imposed. Thus a marriage duly celebrated before the Church's minister, but without the presence of the State official, though deemed invalid in some States, is, so the Church holds, valid in God's eyes, and must be adhered to by the parties; whilst the re-marriage, with any one whatever, of a divorced person whose previous partner survives, is invalid in God's eyes, so that to adhere to it is to live in sin, however much it may have the sanction of a State ceremony. Still, whilst there can be these sharp antagonisms between the claims of the Church and those of the State, and in consequence between their respective legislations, the Church, while rigid in her adherence to the principles involved, ever tries to be conciliatory to the utmost, and, though in some countries the direct and formal hostility of the State precipitates conflicts otherwise avoidable, in countries like the British Isles and British Colonies, or the United States, the most amicable relations prevail between the two, the State using its powers in such wise as to meet the consciences of Catholics, as by providing a method in which the Church and the State ceremonies can be brought together in time and place, and the Church, studiously avoiding all such exercise of its undoubted powers as might bring the ecclesiastical and civil aspect of the marriage into avoidable conflict.

(6) To come back to the character of the Church's marriage law, since it is the propriety of this, or rather of its newest revision, that has been challenged. The Church holds, as we have seen, (a) that the essence of the marriage contract is in the mutual consent, externally expressed, of the parties to take each other as man and wife, and (b) that—antecedently to any Church legislation prescribing a special form and special circumstances, or prohibiting the contract to parties related to each other in certain ways—any man and woman who have attained the age of puberty can validly enter into this contract, using for the purpose any form that expresses matrimonial consent, and using it when or where they please. But obviously such latitude of action is most undesirable to leave to the parties in a matter which, like marriage, is fraught with most serious consequences. Hence (to confine ourselves for the moment to the Church's legislation to prevent clandestinity) the first stage in its development was to require under pain of grievous sin that the marriage consent shall always be given in presence of the Church's minister, and as part of a rite in which the Church's blessing is accorded to the parties. Of the beginnings of this practice there is evidence going back to the earliest Christian times. In the letter written by St. Ignatius of Antioch to St. Polycarp it is declared to be "becoming that bridegrooms and brides should enter on their marriage with the sanction of the Bishop." Tertullian in one place witnesses to the custom when he praises "the happiness of the marriage which the Church conjoins [*conciliat*], the oblation [of the Mass] confirms, the benediction seals, the angels proclaim, and the Father ratifies"¹; and in another where he says that "with us also secret unions, that is unions which have not first been declared in the Church, are liable to be regarded as adultery and fornication."² As time runs on and the Church's system unfolds, we frequently find evidence³ that the practice of being married before the Church's minister with use of the authorized service was regarded as prescribed under sin. An important advance in marriage legislation was taken by the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) held under Innocent III. Experience showed that for want of sufficient previous inquiries persons were at times admitted to the celebration of this sacrament, even when

¹ *Ad Uxorem*, ii. 9.

² *De Pudic.*, ii.

³ For which see Wernz, *Jus Decretalium*, iv. pars. prim. pp. 198-206, ed. 2a.

performed in presence of the priest with the prescribed rite, who were within the forbidden degrees of kindred or otherwise incapacitated for marriage. To check this evil the Fourth Lateran Council, by its Canon LI, decreed that in future the public celebration of marriages should be preceded by the publication of banns, a sufficient interval being left to allow of inquiries being made and information taken as to the power and freedom to marry of the persons concerned. This canon also included a very formal prohibition of all marriages not celebrated *in facie Ecclesiæ*.

(7) These provisions of the Church's law during the primitive and medieval periods witness to her endeavour from the very first to check clandestine marriages by the stringency of her prohibitions. Still this evil went on, and the experiences of the Church Courts—in which the difficulty of obtaining clear proof of the validity or invalidity of marriages so contracted, when they came under judicial examination, was keenly felt—gave rise to a growing conviction that, if a successful remedy was to be found, it must be by going beyond mere prohibition of such marriages, and making celebration before the parish priest of one of the contracting parties to be a condition essential to validity. At the time of the Council of Trent, when the abuses and shortcomings of the medieval discipline were being seriously considered, this question was inevitably brought forward. The famous Decree *Tametsi*, in which this further step was taken, was the outcome of the deliberations of the Council. We may transcribe the portion of this Decree which concerns us here.

Although (*Tametsi*) it is not to be doubted but that clandestine marriages entered upon with the free consent of the contracting parties, are valid and true marriages as long as the Church has not rendered them invalid . . . nevertheless the holy Church of God has always detested such marriages for most just reasons, and has prohibited them. Since, however, the holy Synod observes that these prohibitions through the disobedience of men do not now profit, and ponders over the grave sins which spring from these clandestine unions, especially in the case of those who abide in the state of damnation by leaving the former wife with whom they contracted secretly, and contracting openly with another and living with her in perpetual adultery—an evil which the Church, unable to judge of things hidden, cannot remove without employing some more efficacious remedy . . . the Holy Synod makes those who

attempt to contract matrimony otherwise than in the presence of the parish priest, or some other priest licensed by him, or by the Ordinary, as well as in the presence of two or three witnesses, to be altogether incapable of marrying; and it declares such contracts to be invalid and null, as by this Decree it invalidates and annuls them . . .

This stricter legislation was undoubtedly calculated to reduce the number of abuses, but unfortunately at the time of its enactment a new element of difficulty had arisen which stood in the way of its universal introduction. The Catholic Church, knowing herself to be entrusted by God with the rule and charge of all baptized persons, could never allow that revolt against her authority entitled the revolters to exemption from the obligation to keep her laws. Whatever the revolters themselves might think, or other men agree with them in thinking, in the eyes of God they remained bound. Now, the success of the then recent outbreak of Protestantism had carried away the inhabitants of many whole districts from their allegiance to the Church, and these could not be expected to contract their marriages before the Catholic parish priest; and yet the Fathers of Trent did not wish to see their marriages invalidated wholesale by non-compliance with this condition. It was to avoid any such eventuality that the Council devised an unusual method of promulgation for its new marriage law. Instead of causing it to be promulgated once for all for the whole world, it prescribed that it should be published separately for each parish, and hold good only for the parishes where it had been published; and this with the intention, which was carried into effect, of restricting its publication to the Catholic districts and countries. Thus in the districts and countries where Protestantism was the prevailing religion, the previous law continued to hold, and marriages contracted otherwise than before the parish priest, though unlawful in the eyes of the Church, were still valid.

This did for the time, but gradually the religious conditions of the different localities altered, and, in places which had previously been predominantly Catholic, there came to be a considerable admixture of Protestants. This new difficulty was met by an arrangement which could only be regarded as provisional. In countries where the Decree *Tametsi* had been published, the marriages of non-Catholics were withdrawn from the scope of this Decree, in other words these were recognized

as free to marry validly, even in the eyes of the Catholic Church, in whatever way they chose, provided of course they gave that external expression to their mutual consent which the law of nature itself requires. The Papal Act by which non-Catholic marriages of baptized persons were thus withdrawn from the operation of the *Tametsi* was the Benedictine Declaration, so called because issued in this form by Benedict XIV. In the first instance it was a concession to Holland, but was afterwards extended to other countries where similar circumstances prevailed.

This Benedictine Declaration foreshadowed the general system towards the introduction of which all was tending. The Declaration was found to have introduced a simple and workable settlement in the countries to which it applied, but it left untouched countries like England and Scotland in which, as predominantly Protestant, the Decree *Tametsi* had never been published. The consequence for such countries was, that in order to prevent Protestant marriages from coming under the invalidating clause of this Decree, Catholic marriages were likewise left free from its salutary operation, which meant that practically they could escape the Church's control altogether, and could be validly contracted without sacred rite or blessing or priest or even witnesses. If two persons came saying that they had contracted with one another on the top of a lonely mountain, the priest must take into account that if they spoke the truth they were truly married. Clearly this was a most unsatisfactory condition of things. It was also one which, in the present state of the world, could be remedied with comparative ease if the distinction between Catholic and Protestant marriages already sanctioned by the Benedictine Declaration in some countries, were applied to all, so that in all countries, by force of a general law, Catholic marriages might be brought under the invalidating clause of the *Tametsi*, and non-Catholic marriages be abandoned to the devices of those concerned. And it is just this that the *Ne temere* has done. It must be acknowledged then, that it is due to no sudden thought of the present Pope, but is the logical termination of an age-long endeavour to make the Church's marriage law effectual for the protection of the Sacrament and the checking of abuses among Catholics. Even the immediate preparation for the new legislation must have begun long before the present Pontiff came to the throne.

for in the *Acta* of the Vatican Council¹ we find that the subject was brought forward in some of the *postulata*, and would doubtless have been considered, with results identical with or approximate to those embodied in the *Ne temere*, had not the invasion of Rome by the Italians necessitated the sudden suspension of that Council. It is known too, that many of the subjects which the Vatican Council intended to examine and determine have ever since been engaging the attention of the Sacred Congregations, so that presumably this was among them, and Pius X.'s part has been to give the final sanction to what had emerged from the deliberations of his consultors.

We trust that these explanations will suffice to vindicate the *Ne temere* in the eyes of fair-minded readers, and, this done, a brief word more is all that is required to vindicate the application of the Decree to the case of mixed marriages. It has been supposed by the newspaper critics and others that the Decree invalidates all mixed marriages, that is marriages between Catholics and Protestants. This is not the case. These marriages remain as they were before, except in one, doubtless important, particular. The Church has always been averse to mixed marriages, but has been accustomed, when her dispensation is sought and sufficient reasons are alleged, to permit them on condition that the non-Catholic party consents to have the ceremony in the Catholic church and there only, and to allow all the children of the marriage to be brought up Catholics. And this can still be done and often has been done even since the publication of the *Ne temere*. What the *Ne temere* does enact is that—inasmuch as all Catholics are now under a law which invalidates their marriages when not celebrated before the parish priest and two witnesses—the same holds with those of them who marry non-Catholics. The Catholic marrying under these forbidden conditions marries invalidly, and, as marriage is an act in which two persons concur, the non-Catholic party to such a contract marries invalidly also. How could the Holy See have ordered otherwise? To say to a Catholic inclined to be refractory, "if you marry a Catholic you must under pain of invalidity marry under Catholic conditions, but if you like to marry a non-Catholic you can do it validly where and how you like," would have been to offer a positive inducement to disobedience and apostasy, with fatal results to the Church's careful

¹ Cf. *Collectio Lacensis*, vol. vii. pp. 786—842.

guardianship of this important Sacrament. She has taken, in short, the only course open to her in dealing with the case of mixed marriages, and besides, does her best to open to the transgressor a way of return, if he should ever repent of his sin and desire to make his marriage valid. He has but to apply to the Church's minister, manifesting his regrets and good intentions, and then, if the non-Catholic can be induced to come with him to renew matrimonial consent under the prescribed conditions, the Church will do her best for them. If, indeed, some matrimonial impediment already subsists between the two, and one incapable of being removed by dispensation, if, for instance, the non-Catholic party is tied by a previous marriage, the civil sentence of divorce by which he deems it to have been dissolved notwithstanding, there is no help for it, the Catholic party, if anxious to forsake sin and return to grace, must separate from him altogether. But, if there be no actual impediment between them, or only such as the Church's power can remove by dispensation, then probably the dispensation will be granted, and the possibility of validating the marriage be opened out. It is not, indeed, even then an entirely satisfactory solution for the Catholic party, if the woman can no longer exact those conditions for the Catholic education of the children which she might have secured had she shown herself faithful to the Church in the inception of her marital projects. But it is an improvement on cohabiting on the basis of an invalid marriage, and is the best that can be done under the circumstances.

We have now explained the true nature of the *Ne temere*, and, with this explanation before us, we will venture to ask what justification it offers for all this fierce denunciation with which it has been attacked. We do not wish under this adjective to include the mild criticism of the Archbishop of Canterbury, though we may fairly enquire of his Grace in what way he considers that the Decree has "given rise to unnecessary and disquieting doubts as to the legal validity of marriages already contracted." If by "legal validity" he means the validity they hold in the eyes of the civil law, in accordance with whose prescriptions they have been performed, no one questions but that the mixed marriages which the Church's law now invalidates, are valid in this civil sense; and no one wishes to contest or disregard the purely civil effects which result from the mode of their celebration

before the civil registrar, or the civilly recognized Protestant minister. These marriages will of course be treated as valid by the civil authorities in regard to the right to maintenance or alimony, the descent of property, the custody of children, the liability to prosecution for bigamy, should the Catholic party attempt to marry some other person. They will have these consequences, and the Catholic who is faced by them will be told by his spiritual advisers that he has himself to thank for them, and must submit to them unresistingly. His spiritual advisers will even go further, and tell him (to take the case of the man being the Catholic), that, having induced the woman to go through the civil ceremony with him, and afterwards cohabit with him, he has contracted serious obligations towards her. If she will consent duly to go through the Catholic form of marriage with him, then he owes it to her to continue in the marriage on these conditions, and even if she will not do that, he must consider that he has made himself responsible for her support and must be faithful to it. The one thing which, if he is repentant of his sin and wishes to be faithful to his duties as a Catholic, he must not do is to cohabit with her apart from the Catholic revalidation of the marriage, for to do that would be to live in sin.

From this it further appears how little ground there is for the other charge which the Archbishop states with moderation, but which the Queen's Hall people have hurled backwards and forwards in the most frenzied terms, the charge, namely, that the Decree introduces confusion into domestic life. How does it? His Grace would not, we presume, consider that, in a case which in his eyes was one of invalid marriage, it was introducing confusion into domestic life, for a relative or spiritual friend of the parties concerned to counsel separation at all events till the defective marriage was set right. Yet what else is it that those Irish priests are understood to have done in the McCann and the Moore cases? And what greater consideration for the security and happiness of domestic life could be shown than when, under the Decree, the priest strives to induce the parties to set their marriage right by the very simple process which the Decree sanctions, of renewing their consent before the lawful ecclesiastical authorities?

As for the Queen's Hall fanatics, perhaps it is hardly necessary to allude to them further. They are determined to "repudiate the pretensions of the Church of Rome to

regulate the conditions determining the validity of marriage legally solemnized between British subjects in any part of His Majesty's dominions." Fine-sounding words, such as the British Philistine delights to utter defiantly, but what is it they mean to do, and how are they going to do it? Do they mean that they are going to force the Catholic authorities to admit to its sacraments those who have contracted legally solemnized, but not ecclesiastically recognized marriages? Or do they mean that they are going to force Catholics to withhold all counsels and exhortations addressed to those whom they deem to be living in sin, with the object of persuading them to abandon it. If so they have got a tough job before them, and, short of putting all Catholics in the British dominions to death, we do not see how they are to accomplish it. We fancy too, that this will be the feeling of the Prime Minister, when their proposed deputation reaches him.

If it were possible for the voice of reason to reach fanatics of this sort, we would suggest to them that there is just one way in which they can obviate the difficulties created for them and for us by the *Ne temere*, and fortunately it is one in regard to which we are to some extent agreed, inasmuch as they profess themselves to be as adverse as we are to these irresponsible mixed marriages. If a former Catholic, now a confirmed apostate, marries a Protestant, though the Catholic Church will regard their union as invalid, no difficulty to the Protestant will result, as his partner is not likely to care about the Church's judgment. But, if one of his Protestant congregation applies to a Protestant clergyman to marry him to a Catholic girl who still regards herself as such, let him point out to the applicant the serious risk of domestic unhappiness he is running; let him warn him that, even if for the moment the Catholic girl's conscience has been overmastered by passion or sentiment, there will always be the liability of its resuming its sway over her soul, and forbidding her to remain in a union which her Church judges to be invalid; and let him exhort the applicant, be it the man or the woman, to avoid a species of marriage in which the voice of conscience must inevitably be a seed of division instead of a source of strength.

S. F. S.

The Ethics of Shopping.

To many of us shopping represents one of the permanent occupations of life. Other engagements failing us, we can always go shopping. Superior women may profess to be bored by it, really busy women may reduce it within the narrowest limits of time, but for most of us it represents one of the pleasant necessities of existence. We set out to buy what we need, and we insist on getting it to our taste. Moreover we usually want it at once and we most of us want it cheap. Those of us who have triumphantly enforced all these conditions of successful bargaining, return home full of self-congratulation on our morning's work, untroubled by any qualms of conscience concerning the lawfulness of our conduct, or by any sense of social obligations flouted.

Unhappily conditions of life are far from being as simple as this attitude of mind would imply, and our unconscious egotism may have results far more wide-spreading than most of us realize. In truth, not a few persons have come to perceive that the purchaser is not as free to make his purchases how and when and of whom he pleases, as he has been wont to assume. The "Consumers' Leagues" of the United States, the *Kauferbund* of many a German city, the *Ligue Sociale des Acheteurs* of France and of Switzerland, the "White Lists" published by the Christian Social Union, all, in their several ways, testify to the principle that buyers have responsibilities as well as rights, a power for good and evil that they may not disregard with impunity. For the last ten years, in the States¹ and on the Continent, members of these Leagues have been preaching their new doctrines of the consumers' responsibility and enforcing a new standard of conduct. And now M. Maurice Deslandres,² Vice-President of the French League, comes forward with a weighty volume of 500 pages, in which, not only is a mass of practical

¹ See, for the States, "The Consumer's Opportunity," by J. E. Ross, *THE MONTH*, March, 1911, p. 258.

² *L'Acheteur, son rôle économique et social*. Felix Alcan, Paris. 9 fr.

information bearing upon the subject brought together, but the ethics of buying and selling are discussed in all their bearings.

The main value of the book, over and above the interesting material of which it is composed, lies in the author's elaboration of what he terms a new principle in social and economic relations. Hitherto it has been commonly assumed that hours of labour, rates of pay and so on, were matters to be settled between the employer and the employed. Of late years they have been held to depend mainly on the amount of pressure that trade-unions and organized labour generally could bring to bear upon the employer. No one suspected the existence, in the consumer, of a third party to the bargain, or that it could be shown to be his right and his responsibility to ensure that the goods he purchased were produced under circumstances injurious neither to the health nor to the home life of the worker, nor yet detrimental to his own interests. This principle M. Deslandres presents in the formula: "The purchaser is one of the principal determining elements in the fixing of conditions of labour," and a considerable portion of his very valuable book is devoted to the elucidation of this text. Briefly, it may be said that the whole work of the *Ligue Sociale des Acheteurs* in France and Switzerland is built up upon it.

Needless to say, working-folk generally have been as unconscious of this factor as consumers themselves. To quote from M. Deslandres:

It does not occur to the mind of the workers that it is the public who, concealed in a measure behind the employer, is their real master, more inflexible, more tyrannical, more selfish, more difficult to soften than he from whom they take orders. It does not occur to them that it is the exigencies, the caprices, the passion for cheapness of the customer weighing upon their employer which drive him to insufficient wages, to hurried deliveries, to the constant irregularities of trade. They saddle their employer with the whole burden of the miseries from which they suffer, and they do not realize the extent to which it should be referred to his customers.¹

Nor must it be supposed that the founders of the *Ligue Sociale des Acheteurs*, Madame Jean Brunhes and her fellow-workers, began by enunciating this theory. The

¹ P. 128.

work of the Leagues, both in France and America, was based in the first instance on purely humanitarian considerations. It was initiated by men and women distressed at the conditions that obviously prevailed in many trades; at the long hours of work-girls, at the injurious effect of the absence of shop-seats for saleswomen, of the deplorable conditions tolerated in bakehouses and so forth. Impelled by a generous concern they instituted careful *enquêtes* into the conditions prevalent in certain trades, and when the ascertained facts revealed the reality of the evil, they set themselves resolutely to the evolution of a remedy. The charm, and indeed much of the practical success of the movement lay just in this: that the reformers were not content to demand sacrifices from others, but they hastened to impose sacrifices and restrictions on themselves. Without waiting to formulate principles they accepted at once their share of responsibility for the evils they had verified, and they began, in the old phrase, to practise what they preached.

Thus, while the *Ligue Sociale des Acheteurs*, working through its various branches in France and Switzerland, was drawing up the strict terms on which alone firms could enjoy the privilege of being placed on the "White List" of recommended shops, terms designed to ensure shorter hours and more hygienic conditions to the workers, it was also laying down a practical code of conduct for its own members who were urged to pledge themselves to pay their bills promptly, never to give an order for clothes so late that overtime was involved in executing it, never to shop on Sundays or to allow goods to be delivered to them on that day, and in general to bear in mind that shop-assistants and dressmakers must be treated with courtesy and consideration. In view of the exhausting labour and prolonged overtime necessitated annually by the pressure of Christmas and New Year shopping, special leaflets were issued each autumn exhorting the public:

NOT to shop on Saturday afternoon.

NOT to shop any evening after five o'clock.

NOT to leave Christmas shopping to the last moment.

The two opposite, yet complementary, evils of *la veillée* or overtime, and *chômage* or unemployment, have been the subject of the League's constant solicitude. It is recog-

nized of course that certain trades are inherently subject to seasonable fluctuations, but the *L.S.A.* has had the courage to point out that the state of things by which injuriously long hours are worked through certain months of the year to be followed by total idleness in others, is in no small measure due to the want of foresight, the carelessness and the mania for buying things in the very latest fashion that characterize the general public. Hence one of the obligations of League members is to endeavour to spread their orders for clothes and upholstery over as long a period as possible, to avoid the busy months, and where feasible, to reserve orders for the dead season.

In these and in many other ways there can be no question that the *L.S.A.*, both in France and Switzerland, has powerfully influenced public opinion among the richer classes and has aroused in men and women a fresh social conscience in reference to those numerous small obligations, failure in which entails so much inconvenience and even suffering on those in their employ. Sometimes it has helped to pave the way for State legislation; sometimes, as in regard to the *repos hebdomadaire* law in France which met at first with much opposition, it has persuaded people to accept cheerfully any readjustment of their domestic and social arrangements that legislation may entail. We are all very conservative—whatever our politics—in the ordering of our daily lives, and women are often amazingly obstinate in clinging to what they are used to, however inconvenient to others their customs may be admitted to be. Thus in the absence of our legal Saturday half-holiday and Sunday rest, Frenchwomen were so accustomed to ordering, say, a new gown on Friday or Saturday morning to wear Sunday evening, that any restrictions of their privilege in this direction appeared to them an intolerable interference. So too, even pious Catholics were indignant when they realized that the new law on Sunday rest would prevent their buying fresh *petits gateaux* at the confectioner's on their way home from Mass on Sunday mornings, oblivious of the fact that the supposed necessity for *petits gateaux* at the confectioner's made it impossible for anyone in the bakery trade to get to Mass at all. Had it not been for the timely action of the *L.S.A.*, which threw all its influence on the side of the new law, we might have had the disedifying spectacle of an anti-Christian Government proposing a beneficent Bill on

Sunday observance, which was opposed by Catholics on the ground of the inconvenience it would cause themselves.

Primarily then, the work of the *L.S.A.* has been that of educating the purchaser, of "transforming his mentality." To translate the words of M. Deslandres, the purchaser acts without knowing, and he must be made to know. He is indifferent to the effect of his conduct on others, and he has to be taught to realize the far-reaching consequences of his actions on persons whose very existence he ignores. He is intent on his own comfort and convenience and he has to be trained to consider the lot of those whose lives are dependent upon his.¹

Here we are compelled to ask ourselves whether a similar moral transformation is not needed on our own side of the Channel. It is, of course, absolutely true to say that much of all that the *L.S.A.* has agitated for in the past has long been accorded by law to the English worker. It may also be argued with considerable truth that a system of "White Lists" for recommended shops, or of labels for non-sweated goods, can only be fairly and effectively carried out under special circumstances, or in comparatively small towns, and that its introduction into London would be attended by almost insuperable difficulties. In point of fact, a form of "White Lists" affecting London is still issued under the auspices of the Christian Social Union, but, if I am not mistaken, with very inadequate results.² But that is not to say that we in England have no need of the lessons taught by the *Ligue Sociale des Acheteurs*. One of the charms of the League has lain just in the fact that it has combined unity of spirit with a remarkable diversity in its material aims. Everywhere it has adapted itself to local needs. In Switzerland it has applied its energies to chocolate factories and sweated labour, in French provincial towns to the conditions of bakeries and to Sunday rest, in Paris to dressmakers and their assistants, to *garçons de cafés*, to *marmitons* or confectioners' boys, and to the domestic problem of servants' bedrooms. So in London, if the spirit of the French league could be propagated amongst us, a programme in harmony with our needs of the moment would quickly suggest itself. I am not proposing the founding of a new society—their number among us is already legion—yet some investigation into the moral deficiencies that a

¹ P. 182.

² See correspondence in *Church Times*, June 21, 1911.

Ligue Sociale des Acheteurs would set itself to eradicate on this side of the Channel, may not come amiss.

First and foremost the golden rule of the League, binding upon all its members, to pay bills promptly, would need as much emphasizing in London as in Paris. In theory, no obligation could be more elementary, yet we are deplorably neglectful of it in practice. Putting aside people who live on credit and deliberately obtain goods for which they have no intention of paying, as well as those curiously constituted individuals who regard it as an act of impertinence for a tradesman to send in a bill, all of whom may be presumed to be beyond the influence of moral suasion, there are a vast number of persons who are just unbusinesslike and inconsiderate, who have every intention of paying eventually, but who fail to realize, or to care, how much serious inconvenience they occasion by not paying at once. M. Deslandres quotes as illustrative of the extent of the evil the case of a large business firm which informed him that only 50% of their customers settled their accounts within the year, 30% within two years, and 20% only as the result of legal proceedings which frequently absorbed more than the debt. Yet that such procrastination is the outcome far more of carelessness than design may be assumed from an anecdote that M. Deslandres relates concerning a bookseller in a large way of business. He told him that on two separate occasions when considerable sums were due to him from customers, he persuaded a popular preacher in the town to devote a sermon to the iniquity of leaving tradespeople unpaid, and that on each occasion he received within a few days from £400 to £500 of outstanding debts. What a sermon may do spasmodically by appealing to men's better instincts, the *L.S.A.* aims at doing persistently by propaganda. Its graphic illustration and its skilful pleading by tract and leaflet, have done something at least to create that new social conscience of which we stand in need. If once debts to tradespeople could come to be regarded in the same light as so-called debts of honour, the victory would be won.

Again, if introduced among us, the League would certainly make energetic war on "sales," on the passion for cheapness at any cost, a cost which usually includes starvation wages to the worker. The women who throng the big shops on the opening days of the winter and sum-

mer sales, snatching goods from each other in their determination to secure a bargain, who eagerly scan the sales catalogues to see where a penny can be saved, are as responsible for sweated labour as the East-end middleman who gives out the garments to tailor or seamstress for something far below a living wage. Once more it is the purchaser, not the employer, who imposes the conditions of labour. The successful shop is the one that satisfies most nearly the demands of its customers, and if the customers clamour for cheapness as the first condition of their patronage, prices must somehow be reduced, and the wages of "hands," more especially of "hands" working at home, lend themselves most easily to the process. It is an economic fact that sales, as at present constituted, tend to depress wages and to encourage sweated labour.

Furthermore, everything that the *L.S.A.* has urged against late shopping at Christmas-time applies with equal force to conditions here. With a little forethought most of us could do our Christmas shopping much earlier than we do, and so lessen the heavy strain on shop-assistants during the week before Christmas Day. A great deal too of their propaganda against ordering clothes at the last minute is as needed in London as in Paris. True, we have factory and workshop Acts and inspectors to see that the law is carried out. But it is notorious that evasions of the law are frequent, especially at the height of the London season, and that dressmakers, harassed by importunate customers, keep their girls at work with many precautions, in back rooms, long after legal hours, to finish belated orders. It is the ladies who clamour for gowns at short notice, gowns which in most cases might perfectly well have been ordered earlier, who are responsible for these infractions of the law, far more truly than the dressmaker who technically commits the offence.

In these various ways it is the obligation of Christian charity that the League enforces, the duty of thinking of others, however humble they may be, of being courteous and considerate in all our daily dealings. Here again it is an obligation that we all admit in theory, but yet are lamentably neglectful of in practice. There is everywhere a tendency to regard whole classes of people—shop-assistants for instance—as mere machines, paid to perform certain functions in our existence, but with whom no sort of human relationship need be cultivated. Against such

an attitude the *L.S.A.* raises a perpetual protest, and as want of consideration, resulting often in real hardship to others, is frequently the outcome of want of knowledge, the League imbues its members with the necessity of making themselves thoroughly acquainted with the conditions of human life around them. Hence the *enquêtes* or investigations which social workers abroad organize on a far more serious and scientific basis than we think necessary in England. Certain societies, such as the "Women's Industrial Council," do undoubtedly carry on investigation work on a scientific basis, but the ordinary social worker is apt to be content with a very superficial knowledge, even of a subject with which he is identified. In France it is otherwise. Every demand for social reform is based on a most thorough inquiry into actual facts and figures, and the *L.S.A.* has set a notable example in this respect. Ignorance is so convenient a plea behind which to shelter indolence and selfishness, that often the first condition of progress is to render a profession of ignorance a practical impossibility.

It is from the mass of valuable material collected by the *Ligues des Acheteurs* through their *enquêtes* as well as from the practical experience of the work of a decade, that M. Deslandres has been able to write Part III. of his book, in which he elaborates the doctrines and principles of the Leagues. We will not attempt to follow him through the chapters in which, having established the economic power of the consumer, he discusses in what measure the Leagues part company with the leading French political economists. Our interest in them at the moment is rather moral than economic. What they have effected is to bring home to the consumer a responsibility which in great measure he had evaded in the past. They have taught the purchaser that he has a duty outside his pecuniary interest, that he cannot dissociate himself from the welfare of those who produce the goods that he buys. Curiously enough, it was from Ruskin, from the pages of *Unto This Last*, that the founders of the French League derived their first conception of this theory. The very title of the Continental Leagues, the emphasis laid on the word buyer in contradistinction to the word consumer used by the American Leagues, has helped to define the issue. We are consumers inevitably, unconsciously, but we are buyers deliberately, voluntarily,

and it is as buyers that we need to be taught, in England no less than on the Continent, the responsibility of our actions.

Doubtless it would not be feasible to start a society among us on the lines of the *L.S.A.*, but might it not be practicable to incorporate some portion of its activities in a society that is already at work? Could not the "Catholic Social Guild," or possibly the "Catholic Women's League," add to our indebtedness by undertaking the cultivation of the social conscience in all matters relating to buying and selling? There need be no question of the wider action in industrial matters that the Leagues have been able successfully to take of recent years, both in France and Switzerland. We should be content to begin, as they began, in a small and practical way, educating ourselves in a sense of our responsibilities as buyers, and concentrating on certain small and definite reforms. Later, when, as M. Deslandres would express it, our mentality as purchasers has been transformed, we should be in a far stronger position to exert moral influence on behalf of any social reform that we might wish to identify ourselves with. The voluntary banding together, at some personal sacrifice, with the object of discountenancing anti-social conduct, would give a cohesion to our actions and an authority to our protests, which as individual units we could never command.

One further consideration, of interest in the present moment of widespread industrial unrest, is raised by M. Deslandres' book. It is habitually assumed, on both sides, that any matters in dispute are for employers and employed alone to decide, that the public, or in other words, the consumer, has no *locus standi* in any conflict that may arise, and that his only rôle is to be a passive, if inconvenienced, spectator. To such a theory the leaders of the *L.S.A.* abroad would oppose an emphatic negative. In their opinion the consumer is necessarily a third party to any trade dispute, hence intervention on his part is not only a right, but a duty. Discussion of this thesis, which finds great favour with certain French economists, is clearly beyond the range of this article, but it is at least possible, with the real dangers of syndicalism on the horizon, that the interventionist theories with which the *L.S.A.* school has become identified abroad, may soon meet with considerable acceptance in this country.

VIRGINIA M. CRAWFORD.

The Sign of the Cross.

It is certainly a remarkable circumstance in the history of Catholic worship; that while on the one hand there is abundant evidence of the antiquity of almost all the elements in the ritual of the Church, the details of their practice and development are often wrapped in the utmost obscurity. In nothing does this more clearly appear than in that first external act of religious symbolism which a child learns at its mother's knee. That the use of the sign of the cross (*signum crucis*) comes to us from the second century, if not from the very time of the Apostles, is as certain as anything can be in history. But there is probably no problem in liturgical science of which we know less than of the introduction of that precise manner of blessing ourselves which is now in general use. Still, if the isolated scraps of evidence were carefully collected, it might be possible to arrive at more definite conclusions than are supplied by our Encyclopedias and similar works of reference. It is partly in the hope of aiding such an inquiry that I have gathered together here a few disjointed notes upon the difficulties which the subject presents.

The question of the apostolic origin of the sign of the cross is one upon which no great stress need be laid. Direct evidence there is none, but there are many indications which point to a familiarity with some symbolical use of the cross even in the very earliest age. The constantly recurring references to the cross in the Epistles of St. Paul, both as a subject of glory to the Christian and as the emblem of man's redemption, the passages in the Apocalypse descriptive of the signing of "the servants of God in their foreheads" the Old Testament analogies of the "tau" symbol¹ and of the blood of the lamb upon the doorposts²—all these things, when

¹ Ezech. ix. 4—6 and cf. Epist. of Barnabas, c. ix., and Cyprian, *Testim.* ii. 22.

² Exod., xi. 22, 23.

taken in conjunction with that universal use of the *signum crucis* in every action of life which was prevalent before the year 200, point to the existence of a primitive tradition reaching back to the Apostles themselves.¹ But leaving this aside we may be content to recall the language of the Fathers in the third and fourth centuries, beginning with Tertullian :

At every step and movement [wrote Tertullian, about the year 202] whenever we come in or go out, in dressing or in putting on our shoes, at the bath, at table, at the lighting of the lamps, in going to rest, in sitting down, whatever employment occupies us we mark our foreheads with the sign of the cross (*frontem crucis signaculo terimus*).²

Similarly Origen but very little later :

A third commentator, one of those who believe in Christ, said that the shape of the letter tau presented a resemblance to the figure of the cross and that therein was contained a prophecy of the sign which is made by Christians upon their foreheads, for all the faithful make this sign in commencing any undertaking and especially at the beginning of prayer or of reading Holy Scripture.³

St. Cyprian once encouraged the martyrs by saying : " Let thy brow be fortified, that the mark of God may be preserved intact,"⁴ and he congratulated those who had not fallen away in these words : " The forehead purified with the sign of God could not endure the crown of Satan, but reserved itself for the crown of the Lord."⁵ The same ideas recur repeatedly in St. Cyril of Jerusalem, as for example when he says :

Let us, then, not be ashamed to confess the Crucified. Be the cross our seal made with boldness by our fingers on our brow, and on everything ; over the bread we eat and the cups we drink, in our comings in and goings out ; before our sleep, when we lie down and when we awake, when we are on the road and when we are still.⁶

In more ornate language St. Chrysostom writes :

That sign of the cross which formerly all persons shuddered at is now so emulously sought by everyone, that it is to be found everywhere, among rulers and subjects, among men and women,

¹ All this is much strengthened by the prevalence of the " seal " conception emblematic of the sign of the cross and of baptism. Already in the epitaph of Abercius (? 160 A.D.) we read of the Christians of Rome as " the people having the shining seal " *λαμπρὰν σφραγίδαν ἔχοντα*.

² Tertullian, *De Corona Mil.* c. iii.

³ Origen, *Select. in Ezech.* c. iii.

⁴ Ep. 58, c. 9.

⁵ *De Lapsis*, c. 2.

⁶ *Catech.* xiii. 36.

among married and unmarried, among bond and free. All are continually tracing it upon the noblest portion of the human frame and daily bear it about engraved on their foreheads as on a pillar. Behold it at the holy table; at the ordination of priests; refulgent along with the Body of Christ at the mystic meal. Everywhere one may see it glorified, in houses, in marketplaces, in deserts, on high roads, on mountains, in groves, on hills, on the sea, in ships, in islands, in couches, in dresses, in arms, in porches, in convivial assemblies, on gold and silver vessels, in pearls, in mural paintings, on the bodies of the suffering brute creation, on the bodies of persons possessed by devils, in peace, by day, by night, in revellers' dances, in communities of ascetics. Thus do all vie with each other in seeking this marvellous gift, this unspeakable grace.¹

It would be easy to quote such passages in scores from the Fathers of the first four centuries. St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and St. Athanasius, supply extracts just as forcible as those that have been cited. But perhaps if any further illustration be needed, no more conclusive testimony can be found than that of the bitter enemy of Christianity, Julian the Apostate, the very man of whom Church historians record that in moments of peril, when off his guard, he was observed instinctively to cross himself.² But whatever may be thought of the perhaps prejudiced witness of the historians, Julian himself, in a letter which has been for the first time printed in our own days, expresses his satisfaction with an obsequious Bishop of Pergamum, Pegasius, who ultimately apostatized from the faith. This Pegasius acted as Julian's cicerone, taking him the round of the pagan temples of the city, and Julian commends him because

he did none of those things which the impious (δοσσεβείς; i.e. faithful Christians) are wont to do, tracing on their forehead the emblem of the blasphemer (i.e. Christ—ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς τὸ ἐπὶ μνημα σκιαγραφοῦντες), neither did he hiss (ἐρύπερτεν) to himself, as is their custom, for these two things are the supreme point of their religion, to hiss at the Gods and to trace the cross upon their forehead.³

This passage throws an interesting light upon an entry which appears in some of the oldest texts of the Hieronymian Martyrologium, and which is still retained in the *Roman Martyrology* of our own day. There we read on January 12th,

¹ *Quod Christus sit Deus*, p. 571 (Ed. 1718).

² Theodoret, iii. 3; and cf. Greg. Naz., *Invect.* i. 55.

³ *Juliani Opera* (Ed. Hertlein), p. 604.

of a certain "St. Satorus, martyr, in Achaia, who on passing before a certain idol hissed at it, signing his forehead, and the idol at once fell down, for which cause he was beheaded."¹

It will be noted that in the passages quoted, it is always a question of signing the forehead, and this would seem to have been the invariable practice of the early Christians. For many centuries there is apparently no indication of any other method of making the sign of the cross which was substituted for this. We do however find towards the end of the fourth century a development of the primitive custom which brings us to the usage still observed by both priest and people at the beginning of the Gospel of the Mass. To begin with we find Prudentius, the Christian poet, exhorting his readers

When sleep steals on, and you retire to rest
See that the figure of the Cross marks brow and breast.²

Gaudentius of Brescia carries us a stage further when he urges: "Let the word of God and the sign of Christ, be on thy heart, on thy mouth, on thy forehead, whether thou sittest at meals, whether thou goest to the baths, whether thou retirest to rest, in going out and coming in, in time of joy and in time of sorrow."³

With regard to this triple cross upon forehead, mouth, and heart we shall have more to say later; for the moment I may be content with noting that such crosses seem generally to have been made with the thumb or with one finger. At least if a cross has to be made in so confined a space it is hardly intelligible that it can be done otherwise. And this is confirmed by the fact that occasionally when a more detailed description is given of the making of the sign of the cross over other objects, we not uncommonly find it stated in early writers that only one finger was used. As a gesture with the whole hand would, in accordance with our present ideas be much more natural, we may fairly infer that the use of one finger was resorted to because those concerned were accustomed

¹ "In Achaia, sancti Satori martyris, qui ante quoddam idola transiens, cum exsufflasset in illud, signans sibi frontem, statim idolum corrui; ob quam causam decollatus est."

² Fac cum vocante somno castum petis cubile,
Frontem locumque cordis Crucis figura signet
Prudentius, *Cathem*, vi.

³ Gaudentius, *De Lect. Evang.* (Migne, P.L., xx., 890.)

to act so when blessing themselves. Instances of this kind are fairly numerous. For example, Epiphanius tells us of a certain holy man named Josephus who imparted to a vessel of water the power of overthrowing magical incantations "by making over the vessel with his finger the seal of the cross."¹ Again, half a century later, Sozomen, the Church historian, describes how Bishop Donatus in a rather surprising emergency "made the sign of the cross with his finger in the air and spat upon the dragon."² The reality of the occurrence is of course of no importance; the point is that Sozomen should so describe it. Similarly we learn from Sophronius or Moschus how Bishop Julian made a cross three times over a poisoned chalice with his finger saying: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" whereupon he drank the cup, which did him no harm.³ In much the same way St. Gregory the Great in his *Dialogues* tells us how a certain servant of God named Martyrius, made the sign of the cross with his finger over some bread which was being baked in the embers (*signum crucis digito contra prunas fecit*) and the loaves in consequence came out marked with the emblem of the cross which the baker had forgotten to trace upon them when he was kneading the dough.⁴ It would seem that this practice of blessing outside objects with the cross was as familiar to Christians from the earliest period as that of tracing the cross upon their own foreheads. At any rate it is Tertullian who speaks of a Christian woman "signing her bed," apparently as a matter of course, before retiring to rest,⁵ and some of the quotations which we have already seen, imply that the sign of the cross was made over almost everything that a Christian used.

It is natural to suppose that this practice of tracing a cross in the air over objects that were at a distance or which, like the dragon or the coals, could not conveniently be touched, may have suggested to some a change of custom in the manner of blessing their own persons. But it is also likely that the process of development was aided by a piece of symbolism which apparently attracted much attention on account of the

¹ Adv. Haeres. xxx. 12, σταυροῦ σφραγίδα διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου δακτυλίου.
Hist. Eccl. viii. 28.

² In the *Pratum Spirituale* c. 94. (Migne, P. G. Vol. lxxxvii., 2953)—σφραγίσας τρίτον τὸ ποτήριον τῷ δακτύλῳ αὐτοῦ.

³ *Dialogue*, ii. (Migne, P. L., lxxvii. 212.)

⁵ *Ad Uxor*, ii. 5. "cum lectulum tuum signas."

Monophysite and Monothelite heresies, which were matters of burning theological interest in the seventh and eighth centuries. Upon the details I must confess that I have no exact information to offer, but we find it commonly stated at a later period that the practice which then prevailed in the East of blessing with two or with three fingers, instead of with one finger alone, was adopted as a protest against the Monothelite heretics, and that these last so far accepted the symbolism that they in turn made a point of using only one finger for the same purpose. If this were so, it is readily conceivable that the same persons who attached importance to the use of two or three fingers for blessing external objects, would also have been inclined to prefer that manner of tracing the sign of the cross over themselves which rendered the way in which the hand was held more easily perceptible to the bystander. It was only by a bolder gesture that this could be done, and I imagine that some motive of this sort had much to do with the beginning of the practice of making one single large cross over the body in place of the two small intersecting lines that Christians had so long been accustomed to trace upon their forehead. There must have been a motive of some apparent weight to induce the devout faithful to renounce a practice which no doubt served amongst other things as a continual reminder of the "seal," *i.e.*, the small cross originally marked upon the brow in their baptism.

None the less the earliest instance which I have met with of any larger cross seems absolutely devoid of any symbolic purport. It occurs in the translation of a curious account of the life of St. Nino, the woman apostle of Georgia, a lady whose missionary experiences were so far based on historic fact as to have attracted the attention of Rufinus at the beginning of the fifth century. To date this Georgian biography is apparently very difficult, but the leading authorities seem to think it older than the year 800. In any case it calls attention to a certain miracle performed by St. Nino in restoring to health the Queen of that region. The Queen was brought to her almost lifeless, when, we are told :

St. Nino began to pray and to entreat God for a long time. Then she took her cross [one made of wood that had been given her as a sort of emblem of her mission by Bishop Juvenal, patriarch of Jerusalem] and with it touched the Queen's head, her feet and

her shoulders, making the sign of the cross, and straightway she was cured.¹

This account certainly suggests familiar acquaintance with a manner of making the sign of the cross much like that prevalent in our own times. Moreover there are passages in a treatise doubtfully ascribed to St. John Damascene which support the same conclusion.² Furthermore if the large sign of the cross was in common use in the East as early as the eighth century, it is quite likely to have spread to the West. None the less, to judge from the materials provided by those who have written on the subject, there seems to be a curious dearth of evidence for any change in Western practice. A careful authority like Thalhofer³ is unable to quote any satisfactory example of the use of the large cross in blessing oneself before the thirteenth century. Dom Bäumer in the *Kirchenlexikon* apparently inclines to attribute its introduction to Carolingian times,⁴ but he offers no evidence beyond an appeal to Pellicia, who on examination seems equally disinclined to cite chapter and verse. Father Beissel brings forward an example from the Prayer-book of Henry IV. (about A.D. 1100) which requires the devout Christian to sign with the holy cross "the four sides of the body."⁵ But if the rubric says no more than this, the instance is not altogether conclusive. In the English book the *Ancren Riwele*, which is at least fifty years later in date, the same phrase is employed, but the context makes it tolerably clear that four separate crosses were meant. The passage for many reasons is interesting, if only as an anticipation of the so-called "miraculous brief" of St. Anthony of Padua. It occurs among the directions given to the recluses for their devotions immediately before retiring to rest. I quote Mr. Morton's translation. The Compline prayer *Visita quæsumus Domine habitationem istam, &c.*, precedes, and then :

And finally say *Christus vincit + : Christus regnat + : Christus imperat +* : and with three crosses, with the thumb up above the

¹ See *Studia Biblica*, vol. v. p. 32. Cf. M. Tamarati, *L'Eglise Géorgienne*, Rome, 1910, p. 187, &c.

² Referred to by Krieg in Kraus', *Real-Encyclopädie für Christ. Alterthümer* s. v. "Kreuzzeichen."

³ Thalhofer, *Liturgik*, i. pp. 632, 633. Cf. Beissel in *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, July 1909, p. 32, note.

⁴ *Kirchenlexikon*, vii. p. 1138.

⁵ I have not been able to learn the exact wording of the original. Father Beissel (*Stimmen*, July 1909, p. 32), interprets the four sides, as forehead, breast and the two shoulders, but this seems only an inference.

forehead; and then *Ecce crucem + Domini: fugite partes adversae: vicit Leo de tribu Juda, radix David, Alleluia.* A large cross, as at *Deum in adjutorium*, with *Ecce crucem + Domini*; and then four crosses on four sides, with these four after-clauses, *Crux + fugat omne malum. Crux + est reparatio rerum. Per crucis huius signum + fugiat procul omne malignum: et per idem signum + salvetur quodque benignum.* Finally [bless] yourself and also your bed: *In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, Amen.* In bed, as far as you can, neither do anything, nor think, but sleep:¹

There can be no doubt that the "large cross as at *Deus in adjutorium*" was a cross such as we are accustomed to make now, for at an earlier page of the same *Ancren Riwele* it is more fully described in the directions for the beginning of the Office of Our Lady, thus:

Immediately thereafter . . . say the Paternoster and Credo, both in a low voice, and then stand up and say *Domine labia mea aperies* and make the sign of the cross on your mouth with your thumb, and at *Deus in adjutorium* [make] a large cross with the three fingers from above the forehead down to the breast.²

But it seems equally clear that although this large cross was made, the directions about "the four sides" (*a vour halve*) referred to four smaller separate crosses, and this may of course also be the case with King Henry's Prayer-Book. The account given of Charlemagne's last moments rather suggests the existence of a custom of making a number of small crosses than one large one. Immediately before his death, says the chronicler,

Stretching out his right hand, with such strength as remained, he marked the sign of the holy cross upon his forehead and upon his breast, and he signed all his body.³

But when Ælfric tells his hearers that "with three fingers one must bless himself for the holy Trinity,"⁴ it is difficult to believe that only a small cross on the forehead was intended. The whole matter is very puzzling, and Thalhøfer is not afraid to say that even when we find Beletus, Innocent III., Sicardus, and Durandus discussing the question whether the hand in tracing the bar of the cross should move from right to

¹ *Ancren Riwele*, pp. 46, 47.

² *Ibid.* p. 18.

³ Even here the wording is baffling: "*extensa manu dextera virtute qua poterat signum sanctae crucis fronti imprimens et super pectus et omne corpus consignavit.*" (Migne, *P.L.* cvi. 410.)

⁴ Ælfric, *Homilies*, Thorpe, i. 462. The Homilies were written about A.D. 1000.

left or from left to right, he is not satisfied that the writers were thinking of the passing of the hand from shoulder to shoulder as we make the sign of the cross now-a-days.¹ The problem is undoubtedly complicated by the fact that it is often hard to tell whether writers are speaking of blessing others or of making the sign of the cross upon oneself. The passage most frequently quoted is that of Innocent III., but though he is *probably* speaking of a large cross, and although he clearly distinguishes between blessing others and crossing oneself, the general conclusion is not entirely clear.

The sign of the cross [says Innocent] is to be made with three fingers because it is traced under the invocation of the Trinity, of whom the prophet says "Who hath poised with three fingers the bulk of the earth,"² so that it descends from above to below and crosses over from the right hand to the left, because Christ came down from heaven to earth and crossed over from Jews to the Gentiles. Some, however, make the sign of the cross from left to right because we ought to go from misery to glory, like as Christ also passed from death unto life and from the place of darkness to paradise, the more so, that they sign both themselves and others in one and the self-same manner. But it is agreed (*constat*) that when we make the sign of the cross over others we sign them from left to right. But if you notice carefully, the fact is that we trace the cross over others also from (their) right to (their) left, for we do not sign them as they turn their backs to us but as they face us.³

The *Ancren Riwle* belongs to Pope Innocent's time (c.1200), and in the face of the extracts made above, it might seem a very violent supposition to treat this last passage as referring to anything but such a large sign of the cross as we are all now familiar with. But the real difficulty is at once illustrated and explained by the language of Lucas Tudensis, a Spanish Bishop who wrote only a few years later, and who treats the matter in such detail that in his case at least no possible ambiguity can exist as to his meaning. He begins, for example, thus:

A question occurs regarding the sign of the cross (*de consignatione*) whether when the faithful make the sign of the cross over themselves or others the hand ought to pass from the left to the right or from the right to the left. To which we answer,

¹ Thalhofer, *Liturgik*, i. p. 635.

² Isaias, xl. 13.

³ Innocent III., *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, bk. ii. ch. 45.

as we honestly believe and hold, that both methods are good, both holy, both able to overthrow the might of the enemy, providing only the Christian religion uses them in Catholic simplicity. Seeing, however, that many people presumptuously endeavour to put an end to one of these methods, maintaining that the hand ought not to pass from left to right, as has been handed down to us from our fathers, let us in the interests of charity say a few words on this subject.

For when our Lord Jesus Christ for the redemption of the human race, mercifully blest the world, He proceeded from the Father, He came into the world, He descended, on the left hand as it were, into hell, and ascending to Heaven He sitteth on the right hand of God. Now it is this which every faithful Christian seems to portray, when, on crossing his face (*faciem suam munens*) with the sign of the cross, he raises three extended fingers on high, in front of his forehead (*contra frontem*) saying "In nomine Patris," then lowers them towards his beard with the words "et Filii," then to the left saying "et Spiritus Sancti," and finally to the right as he utters "Amen."¹

Now as the writer is careful to tell us that he is speaking here only of a man blessing himself, and as he has a quite separate chapter devoted to the making of the sign of the cross over external objects and other people, it becomes plain that in Spain in the thirteenth century a sort of compromise existed between the sign of the early Christians and that of the present day. It was a cross which covered the face and reached from the forehead to the beard. Moreover, we cannot altogether disbelieve the writer's positive statement, supported as it is by the gloss of "Archidiaconus" (Guy de Bayso), Turrecremata, and others that there were a certain number of people who, consciously or unconsciously, imitated the Greeks and made the bar of the cross by moving the hand from right to left instead of from left to right. Lastly it is plain both from this and previous quotations that the rule of the three fingers was still very much in possession.

Perhaps nothing better illustrates the confusion and obscurity in which the whole subject is involved than this last point. If there is one matter in which our authorities are agreed it is in the assertion that the substitution of the open hand in the West for the three fingers of Eastern tradition was due to the influence of the Benedictines. Dom S. Bäumer, O.S.B., whose *History of the Breviary* is every-

¹ Lucas Tudensis, *De Altera Vita, Adversus Albigenes*, bk. ii. c. 15.

where looked upon as one of the most important liturgical works of our time, says unhesitatingly in the *Kirchenlexikon*¹ that the influence of the Benedictines and their missionaries in the eighth century brought about the use of the open hand in all blessings and signs of the cross. None the less, strangely enough, one of the few detailed accounts we possess of the manner of teaching the sign of the cross to novices, which comes from the venerable Benedictine abbey of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, prescribes the contrary—the code is of the fourteenth century, but this is only a reason the more for expecting to find the "Benedictine" tradition strictly adhered to.

Then let him, the Master of Novice, teach them all to make the sign of the cross, which is to be traced in straight lines *by the three first fingers* of the right hand, from the top of the head to somewhere near the feet and from the top of the left shoulder to the right shoulder.²

Although, as we have seen, several authorities, such as Innocent III., Sicardus, Lucas Tudensis, Turrecremata, &c., speak quite tolerantly of the cross made from right to left, it seems difficult to meet with examples in the West in which this is actually recommended. Archidiaconus (Guy de Bayso), undoubtedly seems to imply this and is cited as doing so, but the language of the whole passage is not quite clear, for we do not really know whether he is speaking of the big cross made from shoulder to shoulder—or at least, like that of Lucas Tudensis, covering the whole face—or only of the tiny cross traced with the thumb upon the forehead. In the latter case it would be quite natural to make the bar from right to left. Anyway, Archidiaconus says in his gloss:

Although some do the contrary, still in tracing the representation of the crucifixion of Christ, we ought upon our forehead [*in fronte*—or does this mean when making the cross facing, *i.e.*, upon, ourselves, as opposed to blessing others?] to end the cross upon the left side; for they crucified our Lord's right hand before the left . . . as may be inferred from the fact that when a man is taken hold of by his enemy, seeing that he is stronger in his right

¹ Vol. vii., col. 1138. Cf. Sauer in *Kirchliches Handlexikon*, ii. 509.

² "Deinde doceat singulos facere crucis consignationem, quæ scilicet tribus primis digitis dextræ manus a summo capitis quasi ad pedes et a summitate sinistri humeri usque in dextrum humerum protrahatur directe." (Consuetudinary of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, i. p. 402. H. Bradshaw Society).

hand than in his left, the right hand is seized and bound before the left, as Hugo [*i.e.*, Huguccio] points out.¹

I am, on the whole, rather inclined to think that the widely spread idea that in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries many persons in the West made the sign of the cross from the right shoulder to the left, as the Greeks do at the present day, has arisen out of a misconception. The canonists, who all speak of Archidiaconus with respect as an authority of the highest standing, discuss his reasons for ending the cross upon the left side with much gravity, but they apply them to the cross made from shoulder to shoulder. They do not seem to have realized that he was probably thinking only of the little cross made with the thumb on the forehead. As regards the large cross, they intimate that their own practice is different, that all whom they know make it from left to right, but out of deference for Archidiaconus and his reasoning they do not condemn the contrary usage. The great canonist Navarro, who lived in the sixteenth century, speaks as follows in a treatise which he published in Spain in the vulgar tongue.

To bless ourselves (*santiguarnos*) is to make the sign of the cross over ourselves with three fingers passing from the forehead to the breast and from one side to the other. Sometimes we make no express invocation of the B. Trinity, as when we say *Deus in adjutorium*, or at the end of the *Gloria in excelsis*, or at the *Benedictio sit super nos* of the prayer in compline, and on many other occasions. At other times, however, we formally call upon the B. Trinity by these words: "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," naming the Father as we touch our forehead, the Son when we touch our breast and the Holy Ghost in passing from one side to the other. And although there is a great controversy amongst famous authors about the question whether we ought to touch the left shoulder before the right (which is what a gloss in my possession as well as a Cardinal of very high authority affirm) or rather the right before the left (as is laid down by Archidiaconus, by Dominic and another Cardinal); for my own part I agree with the gloss, and that is how I make it myself and so do very many others, as even Archidiaconus admits. Still I am far from regarding the opposite practice as evil, since neither the one nor the other is either prescribed or forbidden by any law human or divine, and since there are good reasons for both one and

¹ This is from the "Rosarium" of Archidiaconus upon the *Decretum Gratiani*. It occurs in the *prima pars Decreti*, canon 5, Dist. xi., "Ecclesiasticarum."

the other as I have declared in my lectures at Salamanca upon that gloss and as I have set down in writing.¹

This would seem to imply that even as late as 1550 there was a diversity of practice and an inclination to regard the cross ending on the left shoulder, like that of the Greeks, as the proper way of making it. But I confess that I am sceptical. If Navarro was capable of assuming that Archidiaconus in the passage quoted above could only be speaking of a cross made from shoulder to shoulder, he was capable of misunderstanding other writers. However it is no doubt possible that the reputation of the *Rosarium* as a text-book may actually have led a few individuals to alter their practice, and there is apparently at least one instance, that of a manuscript York missal quoted by Canon Simmons in which a large cross is directed to be made in the Greek way. The rubric is that which follows the *Libera* after the *Pater noster* and runs thus:

Hic accipiat patenam et osculetur istam: signat eadem in facie + pectore + a capite vertite [*lege capitis vertice*] usque ad pectus + ad dextram usque ad sinistram, dicendo, etc.²

Clearly this is very incorrectly written, it does not agree with other York missals, which give no details about the cross to be traced with the paten; but the words as they stand undoubtedly convey that the large cross, made with the paten, is to end on the left side. Still, there is no evidence that I know of to suggest that this custom was prevalent in England. For example, the Bridgettine nuns at Syon were bidden to bless themselves to chase away the fiend, for

as Chrysostome sayth, whenever the fiendes see the signe of the crosse, they flye away, dreading it as a staffe that they are beaten withall. And in thys blessinge ye beginne with youre hande from the hedde downwarde, and then to the lefte side and after to the ryght side, in token and byleve that our Lord Jesu Christe came down from the head, that is from the Father into erthe by his holy Incarnation, and from the erthe into the left syde, that is hell, by his bitter Passion, and from thence unto his Father's ryghte syde by his glorious Ascension.

On the whole, the evidence seems to show that there was a

¹ Navarro, i.e. Martin Azpilcueta) *Comento o Repeticion del capitulo Quando; De Consc.* Dist. I. Coimbra, 1550, p. 420.

² Simmons, *The Lay Folks Mass-Book*, p. 112.

great diversity of usage throughout the middle ages, as to the manner of recalling and invoking the protection of Christ's cross. It is curious how seldom, at least comparatively speaking, we find any provision made for teaching the correct way of making this symbol. Almost the only example I have come across is a statute made in a diocesan council at Winchester in 1295.

Moreover let the rectors, vicars and parish priests take care that the boys in their parishes know the Lord's prayer, the Creed and the salutation of the Blessed Virgin and how to cross themselves rightly (*et recte crucis signaculo se signare*).¹

Not improbably the freedom allowed, led in some quarters to the introduction of rather elaborate forms such as that which is now established in Spain and Portugal. The fifteenth century *Boke of Curtasye* seems to assume something of the sort, for it tells the child that after his master has made him acquainted with the alphabet,

Sytthen thy *pater noster* he will thee teach
As Christes owne postles gan preche ;
After, thy *Ave Maria* and the Crede,
That shall thee save at dome of drede ;
Then after, to blesse thee with the Trinite
In nomine Patris teche he wille thee.
Then "with Mark, Matthew, Luke and Jon"
With the "*Per crucis*" and the heigh name.²

I take it that the last four lines allude to some rather elaborate formulary similar to that contained in the passage already quoted from the *Ancrens Riwele*, or to others which are still in use in Catholic countries abroad.

To this day in Spain and Portugal the making of the sign of the cross is quite a ceremony, and the well-instructed Catholic, whether child or adult, sets about it with a recollection and a gravity which are a tacit rebuke to the mechanical performance of the rite by many of *nous autres*. Thus the pious Spaniard first makes a small sign of the cross with the thumb upon forehead, lips, and breast with the words:

Por la señal + de la Santa Cruz, de nuestros + enemigos,
libranos, Señor + Dios nuestro.

By the sign of the holy cross deliver us O Lord our God from our enemies.

¹ A. F. Leach, *Hist. Winch. College*, p. 40.

² Furnivall, *The Babees Book*, i. 303.

Then follows the big cross, generally made on a large scale, the hand descending much below the breast, and this, as with us, is accompanied by the words: "En el nombre del Padre, y del Hijo y del Espiritu Santo. Amen." It is to be noticed that many catechisms instruct the child to make this cross with two fingers ("con los dos dedos de la mano derecha").

Finally in practice, though I do not find it mentioned in the catechisms, Spanish children and many adults perform a little ceremony which to the casual observer looks like kissing their thumb. This is in reality the kissing of a rudely formed symbol of the cross made by placing the thumb across the forefinger. The Spanish child fully understands the significance of this emblem. A Spanish lady tells me that she has often noticed how the children in her part of the country, when they fall to disputing about something, will cry out: "I swear it by the holy cross," and will hold up before them the thumb and forefinger set at right angles to each other.

That similar practices were current in England before the Reformation can hardly admit of doubt. The *Lay Folks Mass-Book* and the other devotional tractates collected in the same volume by Canon Simmons, more than once suggest, at the Gospel, for example, that the pious layman should trace a cross upon the bench, or the wall, or his book, and then kiss it. Still more to the point is the mockery of that scurrilous reformer Thomas Becon, who ridicules the supporters of the Mass for kissing their thumbs at this point of the service. Again, there are phrases in other English books besides the *Ancren Riwle*, which imply that the making of a cross upon forehead, lips, and heart was practised at other times as well as at the Gospel of the Mass. The "*Per Crucis*," mentioned in the extract from the *Boke of Curtasye* just quoted, clearly corresponds with the Spanish formula *Por la señal de la Santa Cruz*, with its accompanying three crosses. In fact, Spaniards still often say it in Latin, *Per signum sanctae crucis*, &c. In Germany, particularly in Southern Germany, this way of blessing oneself is also apparently in common use, so much so that authors like Thalhofer and Bäumer compendiously describe this method of making a little cross on brow, lips and breast, as the *German* sign of the cross, while the larger sign from shoulder to shoulder is known to them as the *Benedictine*. There is, as we have seen, as little justification for the one name as for the other.

Although in Spain and Portugal these two different ways

of blessing oneself are combined upon more formal occasions into one act—this combination is also, I believe, retained among the Dominicans at the beginning of the Gospel—the feeling that they are distinct seems never to have been lost. Both in Spanish and Portuguese catechisms they are described by different names. Thus, in a little Spanish Catechism recently revised and at present in common use,¹ I find the following:

Q. What is the sign of the Christian?

A. The sign of the Christian is the Holy Cross, because it is the emblem of Christ crucified, who redeemed us by the Cross.

Q. In how many ways does a Christian use this sign of the Cross?

A. The Christian uses this sign of the Cross in two ways, which are "to sign" and "to bless oneself" (*que son signar y santiguar*).

Q. What does "to sign oneself" mean?

A. To sign oneself (*signar*) is to make three crosses with the thumb of the right hand, the first on the forehead, the second on the lips, the third upon the breast, speaking with our Lord God the while (*hablando con Dios Nuestro Señor*).

The significance of all this is explained in detail in four subsequent questions, and then the child is asked:

Q. What does "to bless oneself" mean?

A. "To bless oneself" (*santiguar*) is to make a cross with the two fingers of the right hand from the forehead to the breast, and from the left shoulder to the right, while invoking the Most Holy Trinity.

The significance of all this is then explained much as we have already seen it explained to the Syon nuns in the *Mirrore of our Lady*. I will only note here that in the older catechisms, as for example in a Portuguese catechism of Blessed Bartholomew of the Martyrs, printed towards the close of the sixteenth century, the child is instructed to place the hand much lower than the breast; the practice being justified by this piece of symbolism: that by the Incarnation Christ our Lord came down from Heaven into the womb of our Blessed Lady; that He afterwards descended into hell—represented by the left shoulder—to rescue sinners; and then ascended into Heaven to restore them with Himself to the right hand of the Father

¹ I am indebted for this to the kindness of the Reverend Mother of the Spanish Community of the Handmaids of the Sacred Heart (*Esclavas del Sagrado Corazón*), now established in London at 11, Upper Belgrave Street, S.W.

—for which reason it is on the right shoulder that the sign of the cross finds its term.

When one notices how much space is given to the sign of the cross in all Spanish and Portuguese catechisms, even the smallest and the most modern, one cannot help feeling that we must surely recognize here the legacy of the long struggle with the Moors, who were pre-eminently to the mediæval Spaniard the enemies of the cross of Christ.

Let me conclude this article not inappropriately by copying the rude verses which stand printed on the front page of the modern child's catechism in Spanish to which I have just referred.¹ The verses, if I mistake not, are taken from the catechism of Father Ripalda, one of the earliest manuals of "the Christian doctrine" compiled for popular use in the sixteenth century.

Todo fiel cristiano—está muy obligado
A tener devoción—de todo corazón
A la santa Cruz—de Cristo nuestra Luz ;
Pues en ella quiso morir—por nos redimir
De la cautividad—de nuestro peccado,
Y del enemigo malo.—Y por tanto.
Te has de acostumar—à signar y santiguar,
Haciendo tres cruces :—La primera en la frente
Porque nos libre Dios—de los malos pensamientos.
La segunda en la boca,—porque nos libre Dios
De las malas palabras.—La tercera en los pechos,
Porque nos libre Dios—de las malas obras deseos.²

These were, no doubt, the sort of verses which St. Francis Xavier sent his children singing through the street to attract the people to come with them to hear that "Christian Doctrine" upon which he set so much store.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ *Catecismo de la Doctrina Cristiana*, por el P. Astete, nuevamente arreglado por el P. R. Vilarino, S.J., Bilbao.

² Every faithful Christian is strictly bound to maintain devotion with all his heart to the holy Cross of Christ our Light; since He desired to die upon it to redeem us from the captivity of our sins and from the wicked enemy. For which reason thou hast to accustom thyself to sign thee and to bless, making three crosses, the first on the brow that God may free us from evil thoughts, the second on the mouth that God may rid us of evil words, the third on the breast that God may deliver us from evil works and desires.

*The "Word" of God: Pagan and Jewish Background.*¹

THE *Lutterworth Lectures*² are described as being upon "Christianity and Language"; and aim, in part, at showing that the original languages which enshrine divine revelation, can convey meanings which have hitherto eluded, and must often necessarily elude, the most accurate of translations. Such, perhaps, is the case when, at the beginning of the Fourth Gospel, we read: In the beginning existed the *Word*, and the *Word* was with God, and the *Word* was God. . . . And the *Word* was made flesh.—Only the dulling force of long acquaintance can make these expressions seem to us anything but mysterious, not to say bizarre. Where we read *Word*, however, the author wrote *Logos*, and set stirring in the minds of his hearers innumerable recollections, surmises, ideas and ideals, which, without much preparation, can never rise in ours. In this lecture I wish to indicate most briefly what the expression *Logos* connoted in the first Christian century, and to do this, we must outline the whole of its long and complicated religious and philosophical history. For it was the confused and sometimes contradictory reasonings, and dreamings, and fancies of whole centuries and many nations, which make

¹ The following essay was to have been read as the second *Lutterworth Lecture*. This was prevented by the indisposition of the writer, who gladly takes this occasion of thanking the Very Rev. Father V. M'Nabb, O.P., Prior of Holy Cross Priory, Leicester, for the assistance he so generously gave, by speaking at a few minutes' notice on a subject cognate to that treated of in the following pages. I have however tried so to state the facts dealt with as not to exceed the scope and intention of the *Lutterworth Lectures*. (Milltown Park, Dublin, 1911.)

In so short a paper I have, almost of necessity, only "said what has been said," as Herodotus would put it; and in many places have followed almost rigorously the admirable articles of Father J. Lebreton, S.J., which appeared first in the *Etudes*, vol. cvi., 1906, pp. 54, 310, 764, and again, recast and perfected, in his masterpiece, *Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité*, Paris, 1910, vol. 1.

² Founded, as everyone interested in the future of Scripture-study among English Catholics will remember, by Lord Brayne in 1910.

the background to the elusive figure of the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John.

The Greek *Logos* connotes more than does the English *Word*—"a part of speech."¹ *Logos* means, rather, a *reasonable statement*; the account which may be given of a thing; the intelligible expression of its nature and character. The *unaccountable* person is *ἄλογος*; disconcerting accidents happen *παραλόγως*. The man trained to consider facts systematically is the *λογικός*; the habit that *collects* and arranges their *λόγοι*, is logic. A *reasoned account*, then; and if the "reasoned" be stressed, *λόγος* tends to connote the *plan* of a thing; its definition; the underlying notion, or immanent idea (as Plato would say); the ultimate, but intrinsic, truth which makes it what it is: if the "account" be stressed, *λόγος* will suggest the utterance, the externalization, of an idea; the notion expressed in fact—a quasi-incarnation. Supposing then, what actually happened, that philosophers agreed to use the term *Logos* in their systems, it yet is clear that those systems would at once fall into two groups; the identical term *Logos*, differently handled, might become the watchword of two instantly divergent, indefinitely ramifying tendencies of thought, by one of which the *logoi* will be set in a mental, ideal, disincarnate world, while the other will involve, in some sense or other, the utterance, externalization, realization, *personification* it may be, of a *Logos*. Let us watch this happening.

Greek philosophy began in Ionia, and was at first anti-religious, monistic, and static. I mean, it disregarded, or denied, the gods, and tried to explain the universe in terms of a single inert element, earth, *e.g.*, or water. Heraclitus² guessed that Force and Motion underlay all things. For want of a better word, he called this unique, ultimate force, *fire*: an eternal, intelligent fire, he held, permeated and governed all things; an infinite, immanent Reason, responsible, as for the whole, so for each part, and for the reason therefore of each thinking man. And this, Sextus Empiricus says, he called the *Logos* of the world.

Then came the Persian wars. Philosophy seemed stifled on the Asiatic coast; but the astonishing triumphs of the European Greeks transferred the centre of activity

¹ The Greek for this would be more accurately *ὄνομα* or *ῥῆμα*.

² St. Justin ranks him among the "Christians before Christ," 1 Ap. 46.

to the West. For Athens, now first really conscious of herself, her powers stimulated to their extremest energy, blazed out into that Periclean period of art and literature, for which history has no adequate parallel; and this was followed, as the first ebullition of artistic emotion always is, by a phase of reflection—in Athens, of high philosophies. But notice: Heracleitos had made philosophy *dynamic*, but had left it *monist*. Now, it becomes *dualist*. Two powers in the universe strive for mastery. Can it be that Persia, materially beaten back, achieved this moral or intellectual victory over her conquerors, and moulded their thought in what was, at least, to become her most characteristic category? For, to the Persian, the whole world will be conceived as the battlefield, nay, as itself the battle, between Light and Darkness, Truth and Falsehood, ultimate good and all but absolute evil. And this seems an essential, too, in the systems derived from Plato and from Aristotle.

For with Plato, God and matter are irreconcilable. God, no doubt, is Father, Builder, Pilot of the Cosmos, but wholly outside it. The *logoi* of things, or (for Plato does not use that word), their *ideas*, shine in a disincarnate world, the *τόπος νοητικός*, broken lights, the prismatic constituents of the comprehensive, white Idea. A later school will make of them God's thoughts, intermediate between His inviolable self, and creation. But for Plato, the opposition between God and matter remains irreducible. The Idea, plunged in matter, loses its identity. At no time could Plato have recorded that the idea was made flesh. Not from him could John have borrowed his Evangel.

His theory is complicated, however, by his doctrine of a World-Soul—*anima mundi*. The Cosmos, he argued, is the best possible: but the animate is better than the inanimate: therefore the Cosmos has a soul. In consequence, he mythologizes freely: he speaks of the world in terms of personality; it is God's first-begotten son, His well-beloved; and the *Timaeus* is full of solemn and tender language expressive of this sublime relation. But this is endlessly important. It is the point at which Platonism may be linked to monist dogma, and so indeed the Stoics were to link it. For as father lives in son, so God's *logos* shall live in the universe, His offspring; it shall be the outward expression of the Invisible, His Image and His Glory. Yet immense as will be Plato's influence

in this as in every other direction, practically none of the later forms of Logos-doctrine are genuine developments of his thought. Not only was he freely "translated" into language not really equivalent to his own, not merely were Platonists confused with Plato, but what he meant as myth—the human expression of the inexpressible—was taken relentlessly *au pied de la lettre*, and his ironical, or pathetic, or heavenly imagery was solemnly used as material for systems.

Yet Aristotle's influence was greater still. It might have astonished him, as it does ourselves at first, to see on which side it fell. For who so hopelessly dualist as Aristotle? What so utterly transcendent, aloof, absolute in the fullest sense, as his God, the final cause of the Cosmos? Source is He indeed of the world's activity; but how? *κινεῖ ὡς ἐρῶμενον*. As our whole being may be set in commotion by the mere approach of one we love—himself unloving, it may be, and even unaware of our proximity,—even so Aristotle's God, unconscious of the world He thrills into vitality, without will, not a Providence, resides disinterested in all save in His own self-contemplation. Disinterested; uninterested. Exactly! and hence, uninteresting. Aristotle's real interest turned world-wards. Our improved conditions of observation have produced results eclipsing for us Aristotle's passionate interest in *facts*—I mean, the tangible, verifiable facts of sensible experience. Here, not in God, was his fittest field of research, and here he observed a force at work, immanent in things, an efficient cause, intelligent and teleological, true Demiurge of the universe, Nature herself, *φύσις*, whom in moments of enthusiasm he will call God. He rejected the "world-soul"; but here we have its practical equivalent. Though he speculated little, if ever, on what this Force *was*, being wholly occupied with what it *did*, the schools at once interpreted him as having taught the immanent Logos; and when the monistic Stoics rejected his doctrine of the four Causes, and kept only the efficient, *φύσις*, which they identified with his Final cause, God, we see at once how both Plato and Aristotle, those gigantic intellects which have dominated thought until to-day, became, in spite of their dualism, at the service of those who would regard all things as a single expression of one intrinsic force, a divine and immanent Logos. Hence the Stoics, though monists, are profoundly coloured by Plato and Aristotle.

The Stoics made much of this Logos; but as it was inextricably involved with their general metaphysic, we cannot but very briefly outline this.

Zeno, founder of the Stoa, seals the final abandonment of all mechanical explanations of the Universe. His system was almost pure monistic dynamism: and so truly does his thought descend from Heracleitos, that he will adopt even the fire-imagery of that philosopher. Life is action; nature is not only the law of the world, but also the source of its energy; not alone its formula, but its motor. The All is the varying manifestation of a Force working necessarily and according to a necessary plan. This universal Logos, this Plan, or,—since here above all we must avoid a static terminology—this Germ inevitably unfolding itself, holds within it all the *λόγοι σπερματικός*, the subordinate plans or germs, of all future phenomena.¹ Hence, all that ever was, remains in all that is; what is, contains all that ever is to be. The Universe is a living Logos: God pervades the whole—like honey in a comb, said Tertullian, not too happily: an Artificer immanent in his work, said Galienus: the *soul* in Nature, to revert to the old symbol. *Mens agitat molem*: Mind thrills the mass, sang Vergil, trying for the moment to play the Stoic. More exactly he tells how in some creatures—bees, for instance, and ants—the One Mind dwells especially. For, say the Stoics, the universal Logos can manifest itself but partially, as *ἔξις*, or *τόνος*—just *resistance*—in mere matter; as *φύσις* or effort, in plants; as *ὁρμή* or blind forward rush, in brute animals; as *λόγος*, finally, self-ruling effort, or conative consciousness, in man. And as *λόγος ενδιάθετος*, pervasive, immanent vitality, it unites the individual to the secret life of the whole world; as *λόγος προφορικός*, it carries him outward and beyond himself to vital union with his fellow-men in love and service, and with God in prayer.

Hence the whole duty of man is, to conform himself to this plan, to live by its life. And hence a splendid paradox. The perfect man is he who best sinks his selfhood in the whole, who joins obediently in the great movement of the universe; who does not struggle, chafe, grasp, shirk; and yet, it is this very man who is the *αὐταρκής* the self-sufficient, the truly Independent. For the universal

¹ These are the *rationes seminales* so much used by Augustine in his account of creation.

self has become his *own* self; the universal Logos is immanent *in him*, is *his* logos. He is supremely, unconquerably autonomous. All sin, is the putting one's self against, or outside, this tendency of law and force in things. How present a help this ethic became in time of trouble is evident; and its enormous development in the persecutions, for instance, of Nero or Domitian, especially in the theological form of which Seneca is the mouthpiece, is very impressive. It fostered too that sense of universal brotherhood which expressed itself in the symbol of a Holy City, or the Dear City of God, on whose register great and small, "barbarian, slave, the mean people, and the poor, and the ugly"—I am quoting Lucian,—were all written, because one living Logos united them. In it, no part was poor, because the whole was sublime. To *choose*, for one's self, Chrysippus said, the life of a buffoon, were dishonour. But should God's plan assign to one that life, well, it were a high thing to be even "God's buffoon." Nay, even those who resist are subordinated by this Logos to itself, and rebels serve in their own despire. "Reflect then," said Marcus Aurelius, "in which class thou wilt set thyself; in any case He who rules the universe shall make a place for thee, in one or another of His groups of workmen." Thus even seeming evils work together for good:¹ and in the Logos there is none but may rejoice. "What can I do," cried Epictetus, "I, a lame old man, save sing to God, and call to all men to join me in my praise."²

It would be impossible to draw out the consequences, or to outline the Stoic solutions to the obvious difficulties of this system which embraced the whole life of man, explained his beginning, affirmed his goal, issued a Categorical Imperative of personal behaviour and of social service, and reconciled the ideals of self-realization and renunciation. It is a fascinating doctrine even to our

¹ Cleanthes sang:

Ah, but Thou hast wit to fashion Even out of Odd, to bring
Law from Chaos, and the hateful make fit matter for Thy love:
Thus of all things good and evil linkest Thou one perfect Thing,
That through all Thy whole creation one eternal Word should move.

ἀλλὰ σὺ καὶ τὰ περίσσεύς ἐπίστασαι ἄρτια θεῖναι,
καὶ κοσμεῖν τὰκοςμα, καὶ οὐ φίλα σοι φίλα εἶναι.
ὦδε γὰρ εἰς ἕν πάντα συνήρμοκας ἐσθλὰ κακοῖσιν,
ὥσθ' ἓνα γίγνεσθαι πάντων λόγον αἰὲν ἔοντα.

² *Ibid.*, 16, § 20.

own minds; it pervaded whole layers of society and occupied most thinking men when Christianity appeared, itself in possession of a doctrine of an Omnipresent, All-governing God, an eternal and divine Providence, a visible revelation of the Absolute, and inculcating at once resignation and active brotherhood. Small wonder, then, that a Stoic-trained century, inclined, like our own, to classify new systems in the two or three categories it dealt with easily, should, as the Apologists make clear to us, have regarded Christianity as a School of Stoicism.¹

C. C. MARTINDALE.

(*To be continued.*)

¹ Cf. Celsus *ap.* Orig. c. *Cels.* vi. 71.

Some Problems of Temperance Reform.

"THE Drink Problem," writes "Junius" in the *Eye-Witness* for October 5th of this year, "is the problem of how to supply drink to the people so that the supply may be as good, cheap, and wholesome as possible." On the other hand, the "United Kingdom Alliance for the Legislative Suppression of the Liquor-Traffic," which was founded on June 1, 1853, emphatically declares that

The Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors, as common beverages, is inimical to the true interests of individuals and destructive of the order and welfare of Society, and ought therefore to be prohibited [by the State].

It is very evident that underlying these declarations are two diametrically opposed principles. "Junius" holds that strong drink, provided it be good, should be made cheap, and therefore plentiful. The Alliance thinks that strong drink, being necessarily bad in its effects, should be put under the same legislative ban as opium and other poisonous drugs. "Junius" implies that the evils of the drink-traffic consist mainly in the adulteration of the supply and the unhealthy circumstances in which it is taken. The Alliance insists that its evils are intrinsic and not accidental. "Junius" would regard as an outrage upon personal liberty any dictation by the law as to what or how much the individual should or should not drink, and would probably endorse the declaration which appears in another issue of the same paper, viz., that "the public-house is an institution vital to the well-being of the commonwealth and very national;"¹ whereas one of the articles in the creed of the Alliance asserts that "the Legislative Prohibition of the Liquor-Traffic is perfectly compatible with rational liberty, and with all the claims of justice and legitimate commerce."² In one of these two extreme posi-

¹ *The Eye-Witness*, Sept. 7, 1911.

² *Declaration of Principles* (1853), No. 5.

tions, if not somewhere between them, the opinion of those who reflect at all upon the matter must finally settle, but it is a pity there should be any divergence of view on a question of such importance. For as both cannot possibly be right, it follows that a large amount of the national energies are expended in advocating or maintaining conditions injurious to national welfare. Can they possibly be reconciled? Could "Junius" be induced to join the Alliance or the Alliance to invest its funds in Brewery shares? Whilst not expecting any such result from an examination of their points of difference, one may hope that on analysis whatever is untenable on either side may come to light, and that the opposition may resolve itself finally into one neither of fact or principle, but merely of application of principle. Both fact and principle seem to be at variance in these views as stated. The Alliance assumes and "Junius" denies that alcohol as a beverage is necessarily injurious to bodily health and civic well-being—a question of fact. And as a consequence, the Alliance calls for, and "Junius" protests against, further State interference in the matter of the Drink-Traffic. The incidental question as to how far the State may reasonably interfere for the common good with personal liberty which is not being unreasonably used, is also a question of principle which would probably not be answered quite in the same way by both parties. The fact is deplorable, for intemperance is too deadly a foe both to morality and civic well-being that there should be divided counsels in those that oppose it. "Junius" and his like assail the Temperance Reformer as if he, not the drunkard, were the criminal. The Alliance folk join the moderate drinker and the publican himself in one condemnation of the sot. And meanwhile the drink-devil whom both desire to exorcise, is extending and consolidating his sway. Between the policy of entire prohibition and that of unchecked facilities, both in a fallen world impracticable, there is a vast space of common ground on which the foe might be met with united forces.

Now, as to the question of fact, although the alcohol-question in some of its bearings is still debated amongst experts, there seems to be now almost a universal medical consensus that the substance is, properly speaking, a drug, not a food, and that, whilst of great value in cases of disease, it does not build up or restore tissue in the healthy body. But this agreement is of quite modern date. In March, 1907, a

great London meeting of medical men was assembled by the enterprise of the *Tribune* newspaper, at which very strong condemnatory views of the value of alcohol in health were expressed. But on the 29th of the same month the *Lancet* published a protest from sixteen of the chief British doctors, who claimed the support of the "leading clinical teachers" and "the great majority of medical practitioners" for the following expression of their views: "As an article of diet we hold that the universal belief of civilized mankind that the moderate use of alcoholic beverages is, for adults, usually beneficial, is amply justified." As an offset to this bold statement the British Medical Temperance Association promptly called attention to the fact that in the year 1903 there was published an international manifesto, signed by 634 doctors, from amongst the most eminent in Europe and America, the gist of which was that

(1) Experiments have demonstrated that even small quantities of alcohol are injurious and that it is not a food; (2) that it increases liability to disease and shortens life; (3) that all animal functions are best performed without alcohol, any contrary opinion being a delusion; (4) that alcohol injures the offspring and leads to the deterioration of the race, especially when taken by mothers.

Recently Professor Karl Pearson and others connected with the Galton Laboratory of Eugenics have questioned the final assertion, but it is safe to say that the prevalent medical opinion of the day is adverse to the value of alcohol in health. The following statements from the latest edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* ("Alcohol"), would probably be endorsed by every modern doctor:

The desirable effects produced by alcohol on the stomach are worth obtaining only in cases of acute diseases. In chronic disease and in health the use of alcohol as an aid to digestion is without the support of clinical or laboratory experience, the beneficial action being at least neutralized by undesirable effects produced elsewhere. . . . The drug exerts a noteworthy action upon the body temperature. As it dilates the blood-vessels of the skin it increases the subjective sensation of warmth. The actual consequence, however, is that more heat than before is necessarily lost from the surface of the body. . . . The largest amount of alcohol that can be burnt up within the healthy body in twenty-four hours is $1\frac{1}{2}$ oz., but it must be consumed in great dilution and divided into small doses taken every four hours.

Equally clear is the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, which writes on the subject of "Alcoholism" to the effect that

Modern knowledge justifies the belief that in health alcohol is never a food in any sense, be the quantity large or small, but always a poison, biologically or physiologically speaking: in disease, it is neither a food nor a poison, but may be a suitable or helpful drug. It should be rightly called what it rightly is, a drug and not a drink: a narcotic and not a tonic.

These are cautious and conservative utterances compared to some statements from physicians of great name, but it is well to put the case at its lowest. It is only a question here of the effects of alcohol on the healthy body.

Since it would be absurd to suppose that all, or even a majority, of those who drink alcohol in whatever form, are in such a state of health that its use can be considered medicinal, it follows that according to medical theory great harm on the average is done to the national health by the consumption of strong drink. "Junius" will hardly find much support in the books for his application of the epithets "good" and "wholesome" to alcoholic liquor, although we may grant that adulteration makes it more noxious than it need be. But he seemingly may claim as on his side common medical practice, which certainly does lag somewhat behind current medical theory; doctors in health continually use strong drink themselves and prescribe it to patients even when the disease is chronic. Hospital returns, it is true, show a marked and continuously decreasing expenditure on alcohol, which suggests that its use as a drug is becoming less generally accepted, but it cannot be said that the medical profession as a whole carries out in practice what it teaches in this matter. Doctors, I suppose, must concede something to tradition and to popular illusions and they find it hard apparently to upset "that universal belief of civilized mankind," to which the *Lancet* signatories call attention.

But it must be owned that the profession has done a good deal in the way of educating present and coming generations. No doubt a great many people acquire a taste for strong drink through a mistaken traditional notion that it is "strengthening" and generally beneficial to health. The growing race will know better. In response to a medical petition, signed by 14,718 registered doctors,

and presented to the English Board of Education in July, 1904, a Temperance Syllabus, containing instruction as to proper food and drink, and in particular the nature and effects of alcohol, was made compulsory in all public elementary schools in June, 1909. The Irish Commissioners of Education had enforced a similar syllabus three years earlier, and the Scottish Department followed suit in 1910. If this teaching is not wholly counteracted by bad home influence and the multiplied temptations to drink that characterize our modern civic life, future generations will not be exposed through ignorance to the danger of sowing seeds of disease in their bodies, under the impression that the crop will be healthful. But there will always be the need of resisting the natural human tendency to seek knowledge through personal experience.

Experience has ever more weight with the individual than theory, and in individual cases it must always be fact against hypothesis. It is, of course, easy to convince the victim of alcoholism that the drug has poisoned his system and ruined his health, but where is the assurance that the strong old man, who has taken strong drink all his life long and is still robust, would be stronger in health if he had abstained? And how amidst the many ills to which flesh is heir, can any particular weakness of the moderate drinker be ascribed with certainty to his consumption of alcohol, as a main or even a contributory cause? The fact is that although alcohol is undoubtedly a poison, its evil effects are not immediate, and may be counteracted by other beneficial agencies. Physical harm is done, but it is not permanent, and, as to morals, it is possible to drink habitually without acquiring in any evil sense the habit of drink. So long as the noxious results of alcohol in the healthy body are a matter of inference, and are, at any rate, later in their exhibition than the benefits perceived, so long will average human nature be inclined to mortgage the future for the sake of present enjoyment.

This reflection leads to a further question more fundamentally concerned with the solution of the alcohol problem. Even though the whole medical faculty in every land were to combine in declaring that alcohol, albeit consumed only in small and diluted quantities, always does the healthy body much more harm than good, we should still have to ask—is there any moral obligation on that account on the healthy to abstain from it? What, in other

words, is the extent of man's duties towards his own bodily well-being? I suppose it is clear that no one is bound to put health before every other consideration. There are many other goods within man's reach, for the sake of which a certain sacrifice of physical welfare may justly be made. The Christian ascetic, for instance, in view of the eternal interests of his soul, may praiseworthy within certain limits neglect or ill-treat his perishable body. Again, in pursuit of knowledge, a mere earthly good, men constantly injure their bodily health, like the brave scientist, whose study of the X-Rays cost him his arm; or risk life itself, like the aviators, who, during the last five years, have paid an annual death-rate of twenty; or like explorers, who brave frost-bite and jungle-fever to add details to our maps; all of whom are rightly praised for their courage and self-devotion. Moreover, at the call of duty, priest and nurse and doctor risk infection, and soldiers, firemen and police, life and limb quite as a matter of course. But I shall be told these are all more or less noble objects, whereas the consumption of strong drink is one of mere pleasure. Well, may not mere pleasure, supposing it not to be immoral or ignoble, be fairly thought preferable to health at any given moment? It is very commonly thought so: health in the City and elsewhere is freely sacrificed to money-making, which is a chief means of pleasure, and the moralist cannot positively blame: not all folly is sin, though all sin is folly. And in pursuit of bodily enjoyment, in sport of all kinds, every sort of risk is run, every hardship undergone, health is lost, strength shattered; yet so long as duties towards God and man are not neglected in the pursuit, it would be difficult to say that this preference of pleasure to health was in itself sinful. The fact is that where goods are of the same kind and there is some sort of proportion between them, and where no other considerations limit choice, man is free to select, and even to prefer the less to the greater; that is his great human prerogative.

Applying this to our subject, I may safely assert that although certain forms of drink and diet are not altogether healthy, the individual is not morally bound to abstain from them on that account. He may reckon the pleasure they cause to his palate warrant enough for his choice, even though there may be some physical penalty to undergo as well. And if he has any reasonable doubt as to the

ill-effects, of course his choice is still more free. For our senses, taste included, although given us to subserve our necessities in the first instance, may be lawfully used besides to procure enjoyment. Pleasure to the palate, a sense of exhilaration, a stimulus (albeit temporary) to thought, all immediate effects of strong drink, are not bad things in themselves, and are therefore lawful objects of desire. Between drinking to live and living to drink there is a wide field which may be occupied without blame. Just as sight and hearing may be employed to give delight as well as information, so may the sense of taste and the bodily appetites, although as these minister to our animal nature they call for closer limits and stronger restraint. If we were bound to make health the first consideration in our whole dietary, we should be fettered with a legalism more intolerable than that of the Jews, and the whole tribe of pastry-cooks would go bankrupt. It is because eating and drinking naturally give pleasure, and because that pleasure may be lawfully accepted, that there is necessity for the virtue of temperance and scope for the virtue of abstinence. Hence some temperance reformers injure their cause, which is a good one, by trying to turn a counsel into a command, and by justifying State interference on the plea that it would be only an enforcement of the moral law. Alcohol, though technically a poison, is not so manifestly injurious in its effects on health that the individual fails in due self-regard in taking it in moderation. To that extent, I am persuaded, is the practically "universal belief of civilized mankind" justified. Temperance Reform is on surer ground when it concentrates its attention on the abuse of strong drink and the injury thus inflicted on the health, not only of the individual, but also of the body politic.

It is clear that if no one drank too much there would be no drink question and no reason for State intervention, for the State exists to guarantee and protect the proper exercise of liberty. But herein the limits of moderation have to be determined by social as well as by personal considerations, and, widely drawn though they frequently are, they are constantly overstepped. Psychology suggests and history proves that in face of a strong and persistent temptation to excess, a large proportion of fallen humanity, unaided by grace, will fall again almost inevitably. The sight of power to do ill deeds makes ill deeds done with

deplorable certainty and despatch. If liquor for the populace were as cheap and plentiful as "Junius" desires, all precedent goes to show that drunkenness would spread with great rapidity. This is not a matter of theory or conjecture. "Is it not time," asks a writer in the *Eye-Witness*,¹ "that we considered the alternative policy of freedom?" Surely that writer has forgotten his history. There was freedom enough when, in the early part of the eighteenth century, as may be read in Lecky—

Retailers of gin were accustomed to hang out painted boards announcing that their customers would be made drunk for a penny and dead drunk for twopence, and should have straw for nothing,²

and when in consequence of low duties and no licensing, "the passion for gin-drinking appears to have infected the masses of the population and it spread with the rapidity and the violence of an epidemic," so that as a result "the fatal passion for drink was at once, irrevocably, planted in the nation."³ And if that is to be ascribed to the mere misuse of a novel and unnational drink, we may point to a measure which was passed in 1830, and which granted practically free trade in beer, with the precise object of wooing the nation back to its old love from its attachment to spirits. Here again freedom failed miserably. A fortnight after the passing of the Act, Sydney Smith wrote:⁴ "The New Beer Bill has begun its operations. Everybody is drunk. Those who are not singing are sprawling. The sovereign people are in a beastly state." Twenty thousand beer licenses were taken out in less than three months, and the consumption of spirits steadily rose!

This result was surely to be expected *à priori*. If it be asked why amongst the well-to-do who have ready access to over-abundance of drink, the phenomenon does not occur the answer is simple. They have other forms of enjoyment—art and literature, sport and travel, scientific and intellectual pursuits. But take large classes of the community whose whole lives are spent in monotonous toil, who have few intellectual pleasures, above all, who have not had for generations any practical religious beliefs or training, and put them within reach of a ready means of forgetting their hard lot—can we wonder that they employ that means without regard for consequences! Restrictive legislation was found to be neces-

¹ Nov. 9th, 1911.

² *England in the Eighteenth Century*, i. 3, p. 479.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Oct. 24.

sary when this country was Catholic, and when only beer was commonly drunk; how much more when religious influences are practically dead, and when distilled liquors have made excess at once more easy and injurious? When conscience is silent, when prudential considerations have no weight, then it is the duty of the State to protect the individual against himself by lessening temptation and by embodying moral sanctions in visible authority. It acts in default of conscience, helping the individual to do what his reason, were it allowed its proper influence, would itself dictate, hindering him from being irrational, in other words, from making a beast of himself.

For the State is not what many modern philosophers consider it—an unfortunate necessity, representing the compromise framed by men hitherto free, as security against the dangers of unrestricted freedom. The State exists for positive as well as negative ends, and brings within reach of its members many necessary goods otherwise unattainable. But there are very definite limits to its justifiable interference. It exists for its members, for their support in well-doing, for their strengthening in weakness, to supplement their sense of moral obligation when circumstances make it necessary. But it is not meant to substitute force for conscience, nor to destroy the probationary character of life by making man's choice of good obligatory. It is only when the individual's failure of duty re-acts upon society that the State steps in. It compels the lower classes to send their children to school because otherwise that duty would be neglected by the majority; it prevents the same classes from ready access to strong drink, because as things are, they would be sure to abuse it.

Of course the morally strong and well-conducted have to suffer from this legislation. They are hurt in their pride, for they are treated as potentially incapable of self-restraint; they are injured in their pocket, for they have to pay much more than the intrinsic value of the liquor they drink; they are inconvenienced in other ways owing to restrictions as to place and time. But these drawbacks are inevitable in a mixed community, and they are much preferable to the terrible disorder that would exist without them. The State cannot afford to run any risks in the matter, it cannot yet trust to the commonsense, prudence, and self-control of the multitude. Without going so far as the Northern Farmer who declared "the poor in a

loom is bad," we must grant that many of the lower classes, more on account of tradition and material environment than innate depravity, are as children when strong temptation is set in their way. The State must legislate for these, and the problem before it is—how to help the weak without unduly inconveniencing the strong.

This State intervention came early enough in history, although the intemperance in drink which is visible to-day is a comparatively modern phenomenon. Here is an extract from an Early-Closing Act of James I. of Scotland. It enjoins

That na man be fundyn in tavernis at wyne aile or beir efter the strack of ix houres and the bell that salbe rongyn in the said burghes.¹

And with occasional exceptions by way of experiment, such as were mentioned above, restrictions have constantly been added to restrictions in the endeavour to cope with the evils of drink.

Some restriction is, of course, necessary. "Junius" dream of a public-house where liquor would be "good cheap, and wholesome," and where the average sensual man would take no more than was good for him, is purely Utopian. The contention of the *Eye-Witness* in another place,² that, if men could sit over their drink in spacious rooms with plenty of leisure before them, they would drink less, (whence the real remedy for the curse of intemperance would be to multiply public-houses and abolish all time-limits!) might be allowed some weight if our people lived under better social and industrial conditions, but, as things are, the traditional Christian psychology of the matter is the only sound one, viz., that by multiplying occasions of sin you multiply sin itself. The fact cannot be blinked that increased facilities for drink amongst a population accustomed to seek its chief relaxation in convivial drinking necessarily means increased drunkenness. The *Eye-Witness*, I know, has tried to establish other views.⁴ By analysis of a recent return, "Statistics as to the Operation and Administration

¹ Green, *Encyclopædia of the Law of Scotland*: quoted in Father Power's *The Alcohol Case*.

² In 1732 there were twenty public-houses per thousand inhabitants in London; in 1909 the number per thousand was 2.6.

³ Sept. 31, 1911.

⁴ Aug. 24, 1911.

of the Laws relating to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquor in England and Wales," it arrives at the very startling conclusion that the fewer the facilities for obtaining intoxicants the greater the excess in drink. The conclusion is more startling than convincing, and before the figures which are given to support it can be held to do so, a great deal more information will be required. If it is a fact that the fewer the public-houses the more numerous the convictions for drunkenness, that fact should be always in evidence, but in the Return no such uniformity appears. And before the law of inverse ratio between public-houses and drunkenness can be established, it must be shown that people get drunk only in public-houses, not, for instance, in the cheap clubs which are spreading so rapidly, and which afford much greater facilities for drinking. Moreover, we should be told the exact proportion of convictions for drunkenness, which imply disorderly conduct, to the whole number of cases, the number also of habitual offenders, and the care with which the local justices exercise their authority, as all this information might profoundly modify the conclusions so confidently paraded. I may freely grant to the writer in the *Eye-Witness* that restrictive legislation, if it is badly administered and unsupported by public opinion, will not decrease drunkenness. Unless legal deterrents bring home to the conscience the danger or the immorality of what they prohibit, they will only suggest attempts to evade them. But it is sheer folly to condemn preventive legislation on general grounds, in the face of sound theory and recorded experience.¹

The question, then, comes to this—where is the State to draw the line? I presume that the position of "Junius" and that of the Alliance represent the two extremes between which the practical politician has to steer his legislative craft. It is by no means easy navigation. The duty on the manufacture and the licensing restrictions on retail, which are the usual fiscal devices to prevent a commodity reaching the community in too great abundance, themselves introduce new complications into the question.

¹ The "gin-epidemic" recorded by Lecky (*loc. cit.*) was finally mastered only by severe restriction. The whole question of the relation of licences to drunkenness, which the *Eye-Witness* treats so misleadingly, is discussed in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (xxiv. p. 585-6), where it is shown that licenses are reduced in certain localities because of the prevalence of drunkenness due to permanent local causes.

The ordinary citizen, it is true, is discouraged from endangering his health by having to pay a fancy price for his potion,¹ and by having to take it at stated places and during fixed hours, but at the same time the character of a monopoly is given to the Drink-traffic, and it acquires a legal sanction which makes further interference, however necessary, a difficult task. The business is lucrative, much money is sunk in it, the more it spreads the better for investors, and yet its increase beyond a certain limit may be contrary to the common well-being. The financial welfare, therefore, of a large body of the citizens is bound up with a business, the success of which may be detrimental to the general interests of the State. It is in this regard that the Liquor-Traffic differs from all other trades: it deals in a commodity very liable to be consumed in excess, and when so taken, very hurtful to the community. Considering the amount of good obtained by the expenditure and leaving out of sight the harm caused, no one can doubt that the sum of £160,000,000, which represents roughly the annual drink-bill of the United Kingdom, represents also much waste and extravagance. And this becomes more apparent when it is seen that about £107,000,000 of this vast sum is contributed by those who can least afford it, viz., the working classes.² The State gets some of this back, about £34,000,000, from the duties and licences, but the poverty, disease, and crime of which excess in drink is one of the chief causes, cost in remedial measures—poor-relief, prisons, hospitals and asylums—a vastly greater sum. Now, the Liquor-Trade exists to push the sale of drink, *i.e.*, to encourage an extremely wasteful form of expenditure, and it thus tends to prevent the formation of habits which make for the welfare of the State, thrift, prudence, self-control, and the like. And the quasi-monopoly conferred by the licensing-system and the heavy duties, tends to crush out competition and concentrate the traffic, both wholesale and retail, in the same comparatively few hands. Hence greater facilities by the system of "tied-houses" for the prevalent adulteration. As I am not attempting a solution, but only a statement of this difficult matter, I shall only say here that it would seem impossible for the State to bring the

¹ A "proof" gallon of alcohol costs about 7d. to manufacture, whilst the duties imposed on it amount to 22s. 6d.

² Board of Education Syllabus on "Temperance."

Drink-Traffic under adequate and permanent control until the element of private gain is eliminated from it. It should be nobody's interest that money is spent unnecessarily on anything, but least of all on drink. At the same time, when there is no actual fraud as in adulteration or the serving of further liquor to those who have manifestly had enough, one cannot condemn the brewer or the publican on moral grounds. They are engaged in supplying a want, the demand for which, in moderation, is legitimate, and it is the business of the consumer to know when the bounds of moderation have been reached. But the fact remains that the more drink is taken, the better off are the drink-sellers, and this anti-social influence is always consciously or unconsciously at work. It is one of the main obstacles to temperance reform.

Another is the danger, by restrictive legislation, of seeming to discriminate against the poor. For it is the relatively poor man that buys his liquor retail and drinks it on the premises. To prescribe the number of public-houses and limit their hours, whilst those who keep their own cellars, or belong to clubs, are exposed to no such inconveniences, certainly has the odious appearance of class-legislation. The rich have to pay for the liquor-duties, but the poor pay for duties and licences as well: the rich have means of recreation of every sort, the poor very few, and this public-house conviviality is the chief. The legislator equivalently declares that the surroundings of the poor and their lack of self-control make restrictive legislation necessary; this is the hard and unpalatable fact which he must advance to justify his action: he *is* legislating for a class, just as the vagrancy laws were made for a class, but it is a class which is largely irresponsible for its failings. The real remedy, which it also behoves the State to see to, lies further back, in an amelioration of the social and religious conditions in which the workers have to live. They too have a right to decent surroundings, and to rational relaxation, and the community should accompany its discouragement of the public-house by an attempt to make higher ideals accessible to its frequenters. Unless this is consistently and effectually done, repressive legislation will only breed resentment, as being apparently the oppression of the poor by the rich, and will be deprived of that recognition of its reasonableness on which its efficiency depends.

There are other problems which must also influence schemes for reform,—the public-house in relation to the family, for instance,—which cannot be discussed now. But legislation to be helpful should have them all in view. In the prevalent abuse of strong drink by so many and in the waste it causes of national resources, there is abundant justification for further State action; defects of personal character in many cases need still to be supplied by external pressure. And the strong, those who do not need tuition and restraint, are bound in charity to submit to them for the sake of their weaker brethren. Above all the general reformation must be motived from within. Esteem for the Christian and necessary virtue of temperance, emulation of the voluntary and Christ-like virtue of abstinence, will do more to free its victims from the drink-habit than closed public-houses. The problem of Temperance Reform is the problem of making Christianity a reality to the masses of this country.

J. KEATING.

Gracechurch Papers.

IV. THE BILLINGTON PEW.

ALMOST everyone at Gracechurch lived in a street: but the streets had mostly, so to speak, no backs to them. Almost all the houses had green fields, or the pretty shore of the lake, behind: and, of course, every genteel residence had its garden, full of fruit-trees and old-fashioned flower-borders.

When we went to the little town, we lodged at first in Watergate, which really was a street, and rather an ugly one, with the backs of other poorish houses behind it instead of nice gardens. Even Watergate House, where the independent Miss Pughs lived, had not much ground of its own at the back, though its blue window on the stairs looked askance into the garden of Miss Mildstone's house; beyond the garden Miss Mildstone had a paddock in which her cow lived retired from the world, never mixing in Society, and probably under the impression that she was the only animal of her kind in existence.

Miss Mildstone's house stood at the bottom of Church Street, with all the front windows facing that way; but only the hall and two small parlours looked on the street; the drawing-room, where Miss Mildstone sat, mostly alone, indulging her extreme refinement, faced the garden, so did her bedroom upstairs, so did the dining-room. It was always called Miss Mildstone's house, though her mother was still alive. Mrs. Mildstone was not nearly so refined as her daughter, and sat in the breakfast-room—where no human being had ever breakfasted—on the right as you came in by the hall-door. She was a pretty old lady, with bright cheerful eyes and an inexhaustible memory concerning the pedigrees of all the county-gentry around. Miss Mildstone did not think it refined to know about the pedigrees of people who had not called; she sat by herself reading the *Monthly Packet*, and regretting

that she had not a longer one of her own. Her father had been much respected, and died well-off, so that she and her sister had each five thousand pounds. Incredible as it may seem she had never had three sisters; there had only been three Miss Mildstones altogether. Miss Mary had died young of a cold caught at her first ball. Miss Valeria had entrusted her five thousand pounds to a wealthy cotton-broker at Liverpool, who had made them into ten, and was now Mrs. Duddlewhite. Miss Mildstone would have liked to be 'Valeria' herself, and it was tiresome that her name was actually Sarah Jane. The late Mr. Mildstone had of course a father too: he was buried in the churchyard (exactly where his grand-daughter had to pass him every time she went to church) but his tombstone only stated that it was 'Sacred to the Memory of Jonathan Mildstone, Gent: late of this Parish: who was an Affectionate Husband and Devoted Parent, and of Such is the Kingdom of heaven.' It left to the mere laws of probability the question of his also having had a father—omitting even to insist on his having been a dutiful son. That he should be described as 'Gent.' instead of 'Esq.' was a daily trial to Miss Mildstone, for she daily picked her way up Church Street to be present at 'Early Service,' never noting anything as she went, for she had learned (while at the Misses Broom's establishment for young ladies at Graceminster), that it is not refined to look about you or to observe the behaviour of common people. Mrs. Mildstone made up for it. From her window in the breakfast-room she saw everybody that went by, and knew perfectly well what everyone was about.

'There's old Richards, with his basket, going up to Gracechurch House for his bits,' she would say, over her knitting. 'Mrs. Richards used to go, but now she's too old, he has to, and makes a fine grumble about its wasting his time, instead of being pretty and thankful to the Miss Graces for letting him have 'em. And good bits too. Saturday was a week he spilt his basket over there—James Nunnerly ran against him at the corner. Jim spends a deal more than he should at the *Cross Keys*—if he goes in wunst of a morning to the *Cross Keys*, he goes half-a-dozen times. And his wife charring all the time while he tramps about the town like a recruiting sergeant. So old Richards' bits were all on the flagstones—and Mrs. Tims she came out and went on at him, for it

was Saturday and she'd just cleaned her street. I never saw better bits. There was half a rabbit, and it's unknown how many pieces of cold toast. But it was the coffee that made Mrs. Tims so fierce with him for spoiling her street.' It was the cleanly habit of Gracechurch housewives to scrub the length of pavement in front of their houses every Saturday morning, as sedulously as if it had been their own kitchen floor. Even to walk over the newly-cleaned 'street' with muddy boots was held poor manners in any but the recognized gentry—the independents; and the gentry did not sally abroad much till the day was sufficiently advanced for the 'street' to have dried.

Cleanliness was not next to godliness at Gracechurch; it was godliness. All the Ten Commandments, so far as Mrs. Tims and Mrs. Hornskull understood them, meant the same thing—'Scrub!'

Mrs. Mildstone always sat close to the window with a 'Church Service' and a key basket on a small table at her elbow. She was excellent company and I was very fond of sitting with her. But Miss Mildstone would generally crop up and carry any visitor away to the drawing-room. She was an excellent young woman, and, I am sure, very fond of her 'Mama'; but she was beset by a dread lest the old lady should seem not very refined to callers of modern views. For Mrs. Mildstone said 'wunst' instead of 'once,' and spoke of its being 'tay-time' and was much 'obleegeed' to you. As for Miss Mildstone, she was made up of refinement, so that without it there would hardly have been any of her left. She could only by an effort bring herself to allude to any gentleman by his name: thus she would speak of our two curates, if they happened to be the subject of conversation, as 'the male' (which always meant Mr. Ireton, her favourite), and 'the other,' as though Mr. Draper had been a lady, whereas he was not himself quite sure he was even a gentleman. Mr. Ireton was more, he was of a 'county family,' younger son of some very big squire, whose ancestor had signed King Charles the Martyr's death warrant. Our Mr. Ireton had long pale hands and thin pale lips, a pale smile, and the palest possible blue eyes. He preached pale sermons of invariable length, from a neat manuscript off which he never raised his eyes; what they were about no one, I think, had the faintest idea; but it was usual to speak

of them as being 'scholarly,' and Miss Mildstone listened to them with a devout certainty of their being models of pastoral refinement. When the Rev. Fairfax Ireton left us at last, it was not because he had subsided into a colourless, flaccid habit of solitary drinking, but because there was a family living for him, somewhere away in the Midlands, into which he subsided noiselessly.

It was not so amusing sitting with Miss Mildstone in the drawing-room as with her mother in the little room that looked on the street. There was less to see and nothing at all to hear. The garden was rather dull, consisting chiefly of an oval croquet-lawn, on which no one ever played except unbidden cats, that did not belong to Miss Mildstone. At times she would open the French window and urge Fido, her dog, to go forth and drive them away. But Fido was of a full habit of body, and, from over indulgence in the pleasures of the table, had grown apathetic in the matter of cats, and preferred the hearth-rug. He was of a placable temperament and averse from the fatigue of killing anything, though able to enjoy rolling in anything already dead which he might happen to find. When this had been the case his mistress would say:

'Fido, you're not very sweet to-day,' and ask you to ring for Maria.

Maria had then to remove Fido and wash him. She was herself much more like a dog than Fido, but of a different kind. Her features were squeezed up like a pug's, and she had the same queer marks and wrinkles in her forehead, and the same gaspy manner. She was not young when we went to Gracechurch, and was not a bit older, so far as one could see, when we left it fifteen years later. She was honest, cross and faithful, with a rabid disapproval of 'followers,' which would have been more serviceable to her successive colleagues, who were generally young and rather pretty. When Miss Mildstone's bell rang in the middle of a winter's night, it was Maria's office to get up and make cocoa for her mistress, who was liable to waken an hour or so after midnight with a 'sinking feeling.'

On Sunday mornings Mrs. Mildstone, in traditional but handsome black silks, accompanied her daughter to church: to evening service Miss Mildstone was chaperoned by Maria, who carried her prayer-book, and sat at the mouth of the pew, in the draught from the north door,

where she had to pray into an uncompromising pillar that allowed her to see nothing but the shadow of her own bonnet.

The chief annoyance of Miss Mildstone's prosperous well-cushioned life was, not that she had no admirer, but that she had had one for years. His name was Zerubabel Pott, added to which he was a small solicitor's clerk, had damp hands and an oily skin; otherwise he was esteemed well-looking, and he could have afforded to marry anyone who, like Miss Mildstone, had five thousand pounds. About four times a year (just after quarter-day) he called, and it was universally believed in Gracechurch that he proposed to Miss Mildstone at every visit. Her refusal must have become, after a dozen years of it, mechanical, and her manner was always gracefully apathetic. Perhaps that was why he persevered undaunted.

But, however inert her opposition to these overtures may have seemed, it was deep and unwavering; if she disliked any 'male' on earth that 'male' was Zerubabel Pott. To her he was the embodiment of vulgarity with his thick black curls, that shone like bars of a newly-polished grate, his slow black eyes, and fat neck well displayed by a very low collar. Any one of the Miss Gwynnes would have married Mr. Pott if only he had asked one of them first, and Mrs. Gwynne had no patience with Miss Mildstone for not taking him.

"He's not gentleman enough for her to be sure!" she would say with a shake of her curls. "Her that's old Jonathan Mildstone's granddaughter—as I remember when he used to sweep Lawyer Pepper's office. Sandy he was, and freckled like a turkey-egg. It was thought a fine thing for him when he married Sarah Oakes, a tenant farmer's daughter, and a thousand pounds o' fortune; forty if she was a day, and a harelip—so's 'twas a pity her moustache wasn't thick enough to hide it. Why's Bubble Pott not to look at her? With her money old Lawyer Twiss'ud take him in partnership—it's well known Pott does all the business. She may go to early church till she catches her death on an empty stomach, but Rev. Ireton'll never think of her."

"She always has hot milk and pearl biscuits before she starts," said Selina Gwynne, who liked accuracy in details.

"Well, none of you aren't going to early church, pearl

biscuits or mother o' pearl, so mind my word! In my time it was enough to Remember now thy Creator of a Sunday, and not be spreading the Lord's Day all over the week, goin' against the Scripture and all. 'One day in seven shall be Mine,' it says; there was no early church in Moses's time, I reckon. If 'twas to be church every day there'd ha' been no Mondays and Tuesdays, only Sundays from the beginning of one week to the end of the next."

After we had lodged for a while in Watergate, Mrs. Hornskull broke to us that she thought of moving to more attractive quarters in Scotland Street; and move we all did. In front our new house commanded an extensive view of a piece of waste ground where rubbish was shot, and Jemmy Kelly, the rag and bone man, turned out his donkey to pasture on thistles and docks. One side of Chapel Street ran up this bit of no man's land, towards the Wesleyan chapel, which gave it its name; so that we were in a position to compile accurate laundry lists for all the cottages, had they wished. Only our bedrooms, however, looked that way. Our sitting-room had a more rural prospect of someone else's garden, the principal feature of which was a noble 'midden,' as Mrs. Hornskull called it, on which manure-heap the proprietor would stand of a warm evening pensively adjusting its more recent layers with a pikel. Lest the uninstructed should be in doubt as to the meaning of this word we may explain that it meant a long-handled, two-pronged hay-fork.

On such occasions we preferred the view from the front, especially if there happened to be a westerly breeze and the weather were sultry. So we often sat in my mother's bedroom, where we saw Sir James Billington go by times without number.

Before, however, we say any more of Sir James and his famous funeral, it may as well be stated here how we came to leave Scotland Street and move to our third lodgings.

One day at luncheon—or dinner rather, for our evening meal was 'high' tea, of no giddy altitude—we had apple-pie, and my mother swallowed a bit of core that stuck half-way, and would neither come up or go down. I fled for Mrs. Hornskull, who seized a saucepan, and came at once to the rescue. But my mother had already rushed upstairs for her bonnet, and she and I were soon hurrying off to the doctor's. By a lucky chance he was in, and he

produced an instrument like a very small hearth-broom, whose bristles folded down flat like an umbrella. This he thrust down the patient's throat, and pushing a sort of sliding spring, caused the bristles to fan out, when he dragged it up again—and the apple-core with it.

"So you're not dead, ma'am," he observed with cheerful grimness, washing his little umbrella in a basin, and then drying his hands on a jack-towel.

When my mother asked what she owed him, he promised to send in his bill at Christmas; but that Christmas never came, neither that year, nor in all the long series of years following, during which Dr. Hart attended to the health of this poor widow and her boys. It must be remembered that Dr. Hart made up his own medicines (and, as he complacently, but without exaggeration declared, "sufficiently beastly" they were), and neither for attendance or drugs did he ever charge these patients of his one penny.

On the evening following this dramatic introduction, Dr. Hart looked round to see if my mother was quite recovered. It was hot, and the spicy breeze that came in by the open window had not passed in vain over our neighbour's midden.

"Good Lord!" said the doctor, making a face as if he had swallowed one of his own pills by mistake.

"We never sit here if the wind's this way, when we're by ourselves," my mother assured him.

On his way out he attacked Mrs. Hornskull, but that lady averred first that she couldn't perceive nothing, and then that it was considered healthy, and altogether refused to tackle the owner of the property in question, as he was her landlord.

"Then you must change your lodgings," said the doctor, coming back into the parlour with his hat on. Dr. Hart made no great account of manners, which he held to be slightly effeminate, and he was not thinking of his hat, but of typhoid fever.

The end of it all was that the doctor insisted we should leave the Scotland Street house, and Mrs. Hornskull asserted her intention of dying there.

"Let folks as likes change house every quarter-day," she observed severely, "I come here to die here, and here I'll bide till I do die. If Mr. Povey's not to have his own midden in his own garden, where *is* he to have

it? And him so clean—why, for all he's a widower, you could eat your dinner off his kitchen floor—'tis as clean as a palace."

By this rhetoric Mrs. Hornskull, who was but sixty, and of an iron constitution, by no means implied that she had fled to Scotland Street as anticipating a speedy period to her existence—merely that she had assured herself it should be her last change of residence. Personally I always suspected that she made the change from the Watergate to rid herself of a married daughter whose husband drank and was "obstrapolus" in his cups—that is to say that he would not sit where his mother-in-law bade him, 'in his stocking feet, so's not to mucky her kitchen.' In the Scotland Street house there was no room for them.

Mrs. Hornskull never forgave Dr. Hart for being the cause of our removal, and thoroughly despised my mother for her weakness in listening to him.

"Men's nonsense is what I never *would* hearken to," she declared, "and I've had seven children and buried four."

So, pursued by Mrs. Hornskull's ironical hopes that we might get our healths in Church Street, we moved to our new lodgings over a cabinet-maker's in that genteel quarter.

But it was while we were at Mrs. Hornskull's in Scotland Street that we used to see Sir James Billington go by.

On the first occasion Mrs. Hornskull rushed up from the kitchen, with a half-skinned rabbit dangling in her hand, and cried out:

"Look out! Look out o' the window, ma'am, and you'll see Sir James Billington o' Coldacre Hall—he's goin' by, and you can see him."

I, at all events, hastened to enjoy the sight, and found it an anticlimax.

A huge wagonette, that might easily have carried a dozen baronets, was moving by at a foot-pace, drawn by very tall black horses of a hearsey demeanour. An elderly footman sat by the elderly coachman on the box and surveyed Gracechurch coldly, for Sir James's property ran out in the other direction, and he did not own a single house or cottage in the town.

"There he is," whispered Mrs. Hornskull, indicating, with one naked leg of the rabbit, an old man hobbling

along on two sticks at the edge of the bit of waste ground.

"That's Sir James Billinton o' Coldacre Hall."

As he seemed to walk with difficulty, and there was undoubtedly room for him in the carriage, it seemed hard to understand why he had chosen to get out.

"Ah! That's his way. He never does nothing like other folks, Sir James don't."

He wasn't much to look at, Sir James wasn't. Of an awkward shambling gait, he seemed twisted all to one side, and it was the business of his unwieldy body to get his legs along, rather than theirs to support and move his body—the two sticks did that. His face was ugly and ill-favoured, his features bloated, his dress suggested that of an undertaker in a painfully healthy neighbourhood.

"You listen a minute and he'll swear," said Mrs. Hornskull, as though proudly directing attention to accomplishments reflecting some distinction on herself.

My mother was precluded by her deafness from enjoying the promised privilege; but I was not long kept waiting.

A little boy, carrying some live poultry in a covered basket, choose to try if he could not walk backwards as quickly as forwards, and approached in this fashion within a yard or so of the irascible baronet. Perhaps the hens, which cackled as loudly as though each of them had an accouchement to announce, prevented the boy from hearing the old gentleman's shambling steps—Sir James was terribly gouty and wore felt shoes. Anyway he would certainly have walked backwards into the pit of Sir James's stomach, had not the latter stood still and yelled out a furious warning.

Till that moment I had no idea there were so many awful words in the decorous English language.

"Did you ever!" whispered Mrs. Hornskull, "that's Sir James all over. Didn't I tell you?"

Long after the offending boy had sought safety in flight the morning air was shaken with explosion after explosion of Sir James's frantic wrath.

Even my mother could *see* that he was swearing, till it seemed inevitable he should have a fit or an apoplexy.

When Sir James was gone, hoisted back into the carriage by the elderly footman, Mrs. Hornskull, rather superfluously, assured us that he was a terrible man.

"It's not words only—not that he can do much now—but he's all the mind to it."

All the same she spoke of his wickedness with a sort of gusto that was half-respectful.

"It's a fine place, Coldacre Hall, and ten thousand a year property; and *he* was a fine man too in his time: the handsomest gentleman in all the country round the Wrekin; and clever they say, and such manners as none o' the young gentry can come up to nowadays. No, he never married—best luck for his wife. And he's no one belonging to him but old Mrs. Redding, his sister, as he's niver spoken to for forty year. She'll have Coldacre Hall when he dies though—unless he can outlive her, as he's set on; she's a year older than him, and he'll not let her come in if he can help it. Some says that's why he gets out o' his carriage and walks—to keep the gout off that's threatening to kill him all the while. They say as he offered Dr. Hart to give him £5,000 if he'd keep him alive five years: Mrs. Redding would be over eighty by then and has asthmy as fo'ces her to sit up in bed all night like a coachman on a box. But Dr. Hart's very independent, and would speak as free to a lord as to a loon, and he told Sir James there were fifty people he'd liever keep alive for nothing; and said as a parson would be more use to him than a doctor—not as I believe that part of it, for Dr. Hart ain't over-fond of parsons himself and never goes anigh church hardly—Dr. Moorcock, he goes every Sunday regular with Mrs. Moorcock, and his man calls him out at the second lesson. That's Sir James Billington; and I daresay you'll see him often, for Coldacre Hall lies but a couple of miles out, this way, and he comes in most weeks to get money from the bank and that."

We were thus encouraged to hope that our first sight of Sir James would not be our last, nor was it. As Mrs. Hornskull said, he came by once a week or so; and, if he did not always swear immediately opposite our window, he always looked ready to do so.

Just after we left Scotland Street, Sir James went up to London to try and find a doctor who would undertake to keep him alive till after his sister's decease. Whether he found one I don't know, but whatever promises were made to him, an accident prevented their being kept. His club was near his hotel, and one evening he sent his carriage away, chiefly because the coachman rather earnestly proposed waiting for him. When he started home it was dusk, and a misty evening with the streets slimy and slippery: in

Piccadilly Sir James had to cross the street, and one of his sticks slipped up on a piece of orange peel, and a hansom-cab went over one of his legs. He was quite unconscious when they picked him up and carried him to St. George's Hospital. For hours he lay stunned and insensible, for his head had come in violent contact with a kerbstone. When he recovered consciousness a nurse was bending over him, and by the dim light he could see rows of beds.

"Where am I?" he asked fiercely, with an oath that made the nurse skip like a pea on a drum.

"In St. George's Hospital," she blurted out. "You must really lie still and keep quiet or —"

"I lie still! I lie still in St. George's Hospital. — Do you know who you're telling to keep quiet? — I'm Sir James Billington, of Coldacre; who the — brought me to a — hospital? Take me away at once. — Now. Now, this instant." And the terrible old man started up and would have dragged his broken leg out of bed there and then if they had let him. He had roused all the patients by his yells and curses; nurses and male attendants rushed to his side, and he was forced to lie where he was; but only till a carriage could be got ready to take him away, for he insisted on being removed in spite of every entreaty of the nurses, every threat of the doctors. And home he was carried, not to the hotel, but to his great house in Eaton Place, where there was only a caretaker. The move settled his fate, and in twenty-four hours he was dead.

But they brought him down to Coldacre to be buried in the huge family vault in Gracechurch Church. Over it was an enormous pew, the only real old-fashioned pew left in the church. When Mr. Knight had the church restored Sir James gave a thousand pounds to the fund on condition his family pew was left untouched, though he never sat in it, or darkened the door of any church for the last forty years of his life.

It occupied nearly the whole of what had once been the Lady Chapel, to the left of the choir; and, as if the oak panels did not reach high enough up, along the top ran a brass rail with silk curtains. By Mrs. Redding's order the pew was now upholstered in black cloth; all the floor was covered with a thick black carpet—only in one place, close to the seat she intended to occupy herself, where she

had sat long ago as a girl, there was a square hole filled with glass.

Sir James had a splendid funeral, and the streets were crowded with our townspeople and country folk come in to see it. The hearse was enormous and looked like a moving nursery of black Christmas trees. There were strings of mourning coaches, and Mrs. Redding in one of them, all crape from head to foot, but with an odd expression on her face.

Church Street was lined by soldiers of the yeomanry cavalry Sir James had once commanded, and in the procession marched two companies of the Rifle Volunteers. There were mutes and black hangings, and all the dismal parade a ghoulish taste could conceive.

The people were quiet and talked only in low tones; it was odd to note how they spoke of his wealth, all useless to him now, of his mad pranks long ago, his skill as a sportsman, his cruel practical jokes, his luxury in food and drink, his fine horses, the handsome face God had given him, and great position—and not one word of any good thing he had ever done. Surely, if he had been lavish through so long a life, he must have been generous at times; there was no mention of it. Nor was there a hint of his death being a loss or a grief to anyone; that his sister saw to his having so fine a funeral was attributed to no regard for him, but to her sense of the family dignity of which once, in her far away girlhood she had been less mindful. For she had fallen in love with a young man of attractive manners and appearance, a gentleman, but of no great family, and only of moderate means. Her own fortune was enough for both, her parents being dead and she just of full age, and able to please herself. She became engaged and had every intention of marrying, in spite of the furious opposition of her brother, who, of course, could have no legal control of her. Nevertheless he stopped the marriage. Meeting his proposed brother-in-law in a club at Graceminster he publicly insulted him, and forced him to a meeting, in which the young lover was killed—Sir James was famed for his skill as a fencer and in the use of pistols. When the news of her loss reached Coldacre—it was her brother who brought it—Joan Billington left her home at once and forever, flying to a sister of her mother's with whom she

lived till her marriage, as an almost elderly woman, with the elderly and aristocratic Mr. Redding, younger son of one Lord Reddingthorpe, and uncle of another, who died a year or two later. Brother and sister never met again, and never exchanged letter or message, except through the family lawyers.

She came down to Coldacre the evening before the funeral, long after the coffins, one of lead and one of oak, had been sealed up, and only asked if all had been done in accordance with her directions. The most peculiar of these was that over the head there should be a plate of thick glass in each coffin; and this had been done.

The coffin was to be so placed in the vault that the glass in the lid should lie close under the square of glass in the floor of the pew. And this fearful arrangement was carried out: the whole chapel, of which the pew took up so large a part, was now Mrs. Redding's freehold, and she was obstinate in having her own way. Without a law-suit about it the rector could not interfere, and out of a law-suit he might have got nothing.

On the Sunday following the funeral Mrs. Redding in all her pomp of mourning, and looking vigorous still, in spite of her four-score years, came to church, attended by waiting-woman and footman, carrying prayer-books, fan and smelling-bottle. The same odd expression was on her face that people had seen with wonder at the funeral; it was certainly not grief, but rather suggested a triumphant consciousness of survival.

The footman held open the pew-door; the maid stood aside, and the lady entered. She walked across to a tall black hassock and knelt upon it, lifting her eyes to the new hatchment with all the Billington quarterings, and the Billington supporters—two angels. Under the arms was the motto, *Non Oblitus Sum*. Mrs. Redding knew what it meant and a queer smile, puckered her old mouth as she rose and walked across to the seat she intended to occupy, and sat down. The footman handed her books, the maid her fan and salts; she took them, and then, with easy deliberation, leant forward and turned her eyes down upon the glass in the floor at her feet. Till then the same imperturbable expression had been always on her face. One look changed it—and forever: with a horror in her eyes that never left them

during the short remnant of her life, she struggled to her feet, and shambled towards the door of the pew; the footman and maid had to hold her up between them as she tottered away to the south door of the church with the voice of the clergyman in her ears as he read out the first words of the service. . . . "When the wicked man. . . ."

JOHN AYSCOUGH.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

The Deficiencies of Nature-Study.

IN his most interesting *Naturalist on the Amazons*, which Darwin himself declared to be the best work of Natural History Travels ever published in England, Mr. H. W. Bates records an experience of his own which to some may appear inexplicable and even incredible. For almost twelve years he dwelt in the forests of Brazil, where nature was practically unexplored, and his fulness of knowledge enabled him rightly to appreciate the wealth of the material which plants and animals alike exhibited for his observation, so that almost daily he had to record scores of new species—chiefly in the insect world—which he discovered. Nor was he a mere collector, but exercised his mind on deeper problems, particularly such as are naturally connected with Darwinism and Evolution generally, which is evidenced by his contribution to the theories of "Mimicry," and his observations on the life-histories of ants and termites.

It might seem that in such surroundings time could not hang heavy for such a man, and that he would find the longest day too short. But, far from this, he appears to have found life in the teeming forests no less lonesome than Alexander Selkirk's, and things became worse as time went on. In his own words:

"I was obliged at last to come to the conclusion that the contemplation of Nature alone is not sufficient to fill the human heart and mind." He adds the following details which vividly illustrate the situation:

I got on pretty well when I received a parcel from England by the steamer once in two or four months. I used to be very economical with my stock of reading lest it should be finished before the next arrival and leave me utterly destitute. I went over the periodicals—the *Athenæum*, for instance,—with great deliberation, going through every number three times; the first

time devouring the more interesting articles, the second, the whole of the remainder; and the third, reading all the advertisements from beginning to end.

This is sufficiently striking; but questions are inevitably raised still wider and more fundamental, as to the rôle which Science is capable of playing in our mental formation. To judge by what we often hear, such knowledge must hold the highest and most important place in human instruction and culture. So, for instance, Professor Huxley emphatically contended in his well-known *Lay Sermon*, "on the advisableness of improving natural knowledge." Such knowledge, he declared, bestows on man the best gifts which he is capable of receiving, for not only does it in every respect add to our resources of material civilization, contributing to the necessities and conveniences of life, but it helps to raise us to a higher plane and enables men to form better and truer conceptions in regard of art and even of religion. In fact, to read his eloquent discourse, the conclusion would seem obvious that he who most successfully cultivates science must most nearly approach to Aristotle's ideal of the perfect man, the *τετράγωνος ἄνθρωπος*, complete on every side, with no flaw in mind or character. But such an idea is scarcely realized in the picture drawn of himself by so distinguished a person as Mr. Darwin, who, after a life wholly devoted to scientific observation—if one ever was—sadly acknowledged that the result had been to "atrophy" that portion of the brain on which depend what he still recognized as the higher tastes. As he recorded in the autobiographical fragment which is found in his *Life*:

For many years I cannot endure to read a line of poetry: I have tried lately to read Shakespeare and found it so intolerably dull that it nauseated me. I have also almost lost my taste for pictures or music. . . . This curious and lamentable loss of the higher æsthetic taste is puzzling. My mind seems to have become a kind of machine for grinding general laws out of large collections of facts, but why it should have caused the atrophy of that part of the brain on which the higher tastes depend, I cannot conceive.

As to the philosophical problems in which all "scientific" speculation must necessarily issue, Darwin frankly renounced all attempt to meddle with them, and confessed

himself in their regard to be "in an utterly hopeless muddle."

It may perhaps seem cynical to remark that according to their biographers the most distinguished and successful men of science, who have done most to spread its knowledge amongst their fellow-men, do not appear to have been greatly sustained or comforted in the end by the thought of what they had achieved on her behalf, not even in spreading the great and enlightening doctrine of Evolution. In the most ample and elaborate records of their utterances and correspondence, it will always seem that as the end approaches and friends or allies drop away from whom they could always anticipate sympathy and support, life assumes a sombre hue, the sky darkens and a note of melancholy invariably becomes dominant; nor does any practical consolation appear to be furnished by the religion which Huxley rather vaguely describes as the most scientific that mankind has yet discovered, "Cherishing the noblest and most human of man's emotions, by worship 'for the most part of the silent sort' at the altar of the Unknown and Unknowable." Nor would they appear to find much comfort in the prospect of extinction, which, so far as Science knows, is all that is in prospect for them.

The moral of it all seems to be that not in science alone can man live.

J. G.

A Catholic Quaker!

The colossal, if sometimes unconscious, self-conceit that suggests and accompanies the revolt of the heretic against the traditional teaching of the Church, is written large over the pages of an excited little French pamphlet called *Contre les Crimes collectives*, whose author, M. Stéphane Mariger, whilst professing himself a Catholic, sets himself to enlighten his Mother the Church on the question of homicide. God has said, "Thou shalt not kill"—therefore, argues M. Mariger, with the downright logic of his race, we must not kill. All taking of human life, whether by private malice or public justice is equally unlawful. St. Paul—we are following out the implications of the author's thought—St. Paul was mistaken when he said of the civil magistrate, "He beareth not the

sword in vain," the Popes were misled when they preached crusades; saints and doctors, moralists and theologians, jurists and canonists, from the dawn of Christianity till now,—all have gone astray when they laid down the conditions of justifiable homicide, and defined the elements of a righteous war. God has permitted His Church to err grievously in an essential point of doctrine for nigh two thousand years, but now in these latter days He has sent Stéphane Mariger to set her and everyone else right!

Such are the ideas underlying this preposterous production which as the mere vapourings of an irrational sentimentalism would seem to carry its own refutation. But it has reached a second edition and there is some danger lest it should be taken in ill-instructed quarters as an exposition of the true spirit of Christianity. It is, as we have said, the true spirit of heresy that pervades it. The writer takes occasion of the execution of two murderers to declaim against the inherent right of Society thus to defend itself. He ascribes the explosion of powder which wrecked *La Liberté*, and killed 220 men, to the desire on the part of Divine Providence to warn Society of the general iniquity of munitions of war—evil means to an evil end! He has the impudence to dictate what the Holy Father should do, *viz.*, command the Catholic soldiers of Italy now in Tripoli to throw down their weapons, and whenever an execution of a criminal is announced, send a formal protest against it! There seems no limit to the folly to which a good impulse, uncontrolled by reason, may not urge its victim. His arguments are familiar enough; they are common to sentimentalists all the world over who rank physical pain and the destruction of animal life as the greatest of evils. But this is the first time, we fancy, that they have masqueraded as Catholicism. We trust that it will be the last. The glorious cause of Peace upon Earth can only be injured by such irrational support. It is high time that Catholics should establish and spread Peace Societies on sound lines, seeing that the crudest Tolstoyism has apparently infected some members of the Church. We hope that the next Bulletin of the *Ligue des Catholiques Français* will contain a vigorous repudiation of M. Stéphane Mariger and all his works,—at any rate, if the rest are like this.

J. K.

The Unconsecrated Chalice yet again.

Since the publication of the Flotsam note in the last number of *THE MONTH*, the writer has to thank the kindness of one or two other correspondents for further information as to the persistence of the custom of the purification after Holy Communion. The evidence now seems to show that the continuance of this usage in the English College at Lisbon was probably due to the fact that Portugal had shown itself especially conservative in adhering to the practice. For example a most reliable observer assures us that when he was in Lisbon as recently as 1893, the unconsecrated chalice was then still offered to communicants in the churches he attended, none of which had any connection with the English College. Moreover, one of the community of the Bridgettine nuns at Chudleigh, Devon, has been kind enough to write that after their return to England in the nineteenth century, they brought with them this custom of the purification after Holy Communion. "It was in use amongst us," she states, "up to the year 1867, when the late Right Rev. William Vaughan, Bishop of Plymouth, made his first visitation of our Convent, but at his suggestion, the custom was abolished." The informant who sends these details is kind enough to add:

The following is how the purification was taken. On Communion-days, at the Post-Communion of the Mass, one of the lay-Sisters carried a chalice containing water and a linen purificator round to each nun, beginning with the Abbess. She presented the chalice to each in turn, and after each had drunk she wiped the chalice with the purificator. We still have the curious old chalice which was used for this. It is made of earthenware—and probably made of this material to be in conformity with our holy rule, which forbids the nuns, except those who are in charge of the temporal affairs of the monastery, to touch either gold or silver. The ground is white, and it has a floral design in blue, and on the centre of the front of the cup is I.H.S., surrounded with rays of glory. It is quite like a chalice in shape, and held, when filled to the brim, a pint-and-a-half of water.

This indirectly affords an interesting confirmation of the Portuguese hypothesis, for the Bridgettine nuns of

Syon, after sojourning for a while at Rouen, spent nearly two centuries at Lisbon before returning to England.

The correspondent just mentioned concludes her letter with the query:

Do you think the custom that some people have, particularly the Irish, of drinking a little water after Communion before any food is taken, is a survival of the use of the purification? One of our Irish Sisters says that her grandmother taught her, whenever she went to Holy Communion, that before taking any food she ought to take three sips of water in honour of the Blessed Trinity.

Some of our readers may possibly be able to tell us more of the existence of this curious tradition.

H.T.

"Catholic" History.

We have already pointed out¹ that the quarrel which Catholics have with the new *Encyclopædia Britannica*, does not turn so much on the actual performance of that work as on the professions which preceded it and are embodied in its Preface. No doubt, even though such professions had not been made, Catholic scholars would have taken occasion of the publication to expose and refute whatever they found in it false and misleading. But they would have done so under no special sense of injustice. From a non-Catholic tree they would naturally expect non-Catholic fruit, and where, like the trunk in the *Georgics*, it produced *novas frondes et non sua poma* in the shape of really Catholic articles, they would not withhold their admiration. It was the strong bid that was made for Catholic support, on the strength of what in the circumstances was an impracticable undertaking, that has aroused and justified the indignation of Catholics with the *Encyclopædia*.

The discussion which has since ensued, besides showing what a vast gap there is between the *Encyclopædia's* promise and its performance, will have its use if it disposes of the strange idea seemingly entertained by some

¹ THE MONTH, October, 1911, "A Rash Undertaking."

Catholic apologists for the work, of the character of history. It is an idea nowhere prominently expressed, but rather implied in some of their arguments and illustrations. One gathers from these the impression that, supposing in both cases a well-deserved reputation for historical research, the views of a non-Catholic historian are as likely, *à priori*, to be correct as those of a Catholic; in other words, that political history resembles natural history in being a sort of neutral subject, not necessarily affected by differences of religious standpoint; and that consequently, in spite of their professions, the Editors of the *Encyclopædia* were not to blame if in selecting writers for Catholic subjects they made eminent scholarship rather than creed their criterion. That certainly would be a natural non-Catholic attitude, but it should hardly approve itself to a Catholic. All history is in a sense religious, not merely because concerned with the doings of God's creatures and because in Christian times God's Church itself enters constantly and everywhere into the historical arena, but because of the action of Divine Providence, which, although it can rarely be traced with certainty, we know from Christ's revelation is unremittingly engaged in human affairs. Consequently the believer in God's providence must necessarily have a truer insight into historical events than he who thinks the whole interplay of human actions is dictated by the minds and intentions of men. But this insight of the convinced theist is comparatively unimportant if measured with the advantage the historian gains by a full acceptance of all God's revelation. The object of history is the record of truth; the more assured and extended his grasp of truth, the better *ceteris paribus* the historian. Truth cannot contradict truth, and therefore what is once infallibly possessed serves as a test and a measure for that which is sought. Accordingly Catholics can turn with implicit confidence to the history, for instance, of the Papacy by scholars like Dr. Pastor or Canon Barry, because they know that whilst all the facts are carefully envisaged and placed in their proper setting, nothing will be set forth as true which is inconsistent with known truth concerning the nature and functions of God's Church. And they can read Denifle's or Grisar's account of Luther with the knowledge that they will acquire a substantially accurate picture of the man, who, whatever else he was, was certainly a rebel against

Divine authority and a teacher of doctrines monstrously false. On the other hand, those who do not start with the initial certainty that the Church of Rome is a Divine institution, and that God's Spirit has dictated throughout the ages the main lines at least of her evolution, cannot possibly, however industrious and fair-minded in intent, give a true picture of her action on human history. Like Gibbon, they must constantly ascribe to human forces the development of what they consider the work of man's hands.

Thus the Catholic, whether he deals with theology, philosophy or history, has an immense and permanent advantage over the "outsider." He knows already what they have still to seek for, and by means of his knowledge, he can reach higher, wider, and deeper than they. He is doubtless exposed to the danger of not sufficiently discriminating between error and error, and overlooking the elements of truth and goodness which adhere to non-Catholic systems, but in his positive grasp and range of truth he is immensely the superior of the non-Catholic. The "outsider," of course, cannot be expected to recognize this, but all Catholics should.

J. K.

Reviews.

I.—BELLARMINE AND THE SIXTO-CLEMENTINE VULGATE.¹

QUITE recently, in his *Bellarmino avant son Cardinalat*, Père le Bachelet announced the speedy appearance of a study on Bellarmine's connection with the preparation of the Clementine Edition of the Vulgate. Now it is published, and we venture to think will be recognized as having effectually removed one impediment which has hitherto stood in the way of Bellarmine's beatification. This little volume contains, as its title indicates, two parts, one of which gives the documents bearing on the subject, documents which with an exception or two are now for the first time published; and the other contains a study of the import of these documents. The book does not profess to be more than a contribution to the history of the Vulgate version and its revision in the sixteenth century, but it comprises fairly completely Bellarmine's part in this matter, and shows from his own writings what sound views he held on the nature of the revision which was possible and desirable, and on the nature of the authorization which should be attached to the new edition—sound views which were in fact those that prevailed. The *Dissertations de editione Latina Vulgata quo sensu a Concilio Tridentino definitum sit ut pro authentica habeatur* 1586-91, and *de ratione servanda in bibliis corrigendis*, will be recognized by modern theologians and textual critics as models in this respect.

But particularly valuable is the light now cast on the question of Bellarmine's advice as to the procedure to be followed in withdrawing the Sixtine Edition and substituting the Clementine. To understand this it must be borne in mind that when the Revisory Commission appointed by Gregory XIII.

¹ *Etudes de Théologie historique publiées sous la direction des Professeurs de Théologie à l'Institut Catholique de Paris. Bellarmine et la Bible Sixto-Clémentine. Etude et documents inédits. Par le R. P. Xavier-Marie le Bachelet, S. J. Paris : Gabriel Beauchesne. Pp. xi, 210. Price, 5 fr., 1911.*

submitted their revised text to Sixtus V., then reigning, this Pope was not pleased with it, and insisted on taking the matter into his own hands. For several months he was occupied in correcting it personally, and by the spring of 1590 he had finished, and went so far as to have the revised text then prepared printed, together with the text of a Bull, *Æternus ille*, of the most drastic character, and to cause some copies of both the Bible and the Bull to be actually distributed through the world. Then he died in August, 1590, and the problem at once arose what was to be done in so critical an occasion, for Sixtus V., in spite of his conspicuous talents in other respects, was quite incompetent for critical work of this kind. Bellarmine's account, in his Autobiography, is that when on his accession Gregory XIV. asked his consultors what should be done about the Sixtine Bible, which could not be allowed to pass with all its shortcomings into the received version of the Church, "important persons advocated a public proscription [of the Sixtine edition], but N. [that is, Bellarmine himself] . . . proved in the presence of the Pope that such a proscription would not be suitable; that it would be better to revise this Bible so that it could still appear, and the honour of Sixtus remain intact. To obtain this result it was only necessary to remove as quickly as possible the regrettable changes, and reprint the Bible under the name of the same Pope, and in a preface say that, as a consequence of the excessive haste with which it had been done, some faults due to printers and others (*errata vel typographorum vel aliorum*) had slipped into the first edition." Bellarmine goes on to say that Gregory XIV. approved of this counsel, and, after the death of Gregory XIV. and Innocent IX. (who reigned only two months), Clement VIII. published, in the name of Sixtus, the Bible thus revised. It will be noticed that in this account, written in 1613, Bellarmine speaks of Sixtus's Bible as "in its first edition," that is, as already published; and in this advice, given to Gregory XIV. in 1591, where he recommends a statement just to this effect in the Preface, he also recommends a further statement that Sixtus himself "had noted the errors that had got into this already published first edition, and wished to have the work revised once more (*suum illud opus sub incudem revocare voluisse*), but had been prevented by death; whereas the actual Preface, of which Bellarmine was the author, speaks of the Sixtine edition as not yet published at the time when

Sixtus decided to submit it to the further correction in the midst of which correction he died. There is then an apparent contradiction between the actual Preface and these two other documents, and there is the (alleged) fact that, in opposition to what the actual Preface says, Sixtus *had* published his Bible with the Bull of Promulgation attached, and had thus committed the Church to all its errors, which the Bull sanctioned with a most solemn approval ; and it is on the ground of this apparent contradiction that Bellarmine was charged by the Promotor Fidei when his Process was before the Congregation of Rites, with having shown in the published Preface, a lack of veracity inconsistent with sanctity of life. Benedict XIV. on that occasion declared that the Promotor Fidei had failed to prove his point, but none the less the Promotor has been followed by all who dislike Bellarmine, especially by Dollinger, who devoted one of his *Beiträge* to this question. It has been urged with justice against this charge that, if made good, it must include in its condemnation not Bellarmine only, but all concerned in the drawing up of the Preface, the Pope included ; nor as Père le Bachelet points out, when it is said that Bellarmine wrote this Preface, is he necessarily the author of every phrase in it. It is just these detailed points which are liable to be altered on the authority of the Commission, or the supreme authority, for whose use the draft of the text has been drawn up. But, apart from this minor point, the documents Père le Bachelet publishes prove conclusively that, though the Sixtine Bible had been printed, and some copies of it sent out to Sovereigns, universities and others, or even sold to applicants, and though the original of the Bull *Æternus ille* found by Mgr. Baumgarten in 1901 contains the text of a certificate by the Magister Cursorum attesting that it was promulgated on April 10, 1590, it certainly was not promulgated on that date, as the Bible itself was not then out of the press, and Olivarez's letters to Philip II. show that Sixtus was still engaged in further correcting it as late as May 28th of that year. Sound authorities, including Camillo Borghese, afterwards Paul V., who at the time was an Auditor of the Apostolic Camera, testified that there never was a formal promulgation of the Sixtine Bull or Bible, nor, it seems, is there any registration of promulgation in the registers of the Papal Chancery. Thus the text of the certificate was written in anticipation, as copy for the printers at a time when Sixtus hoped the promulgation on April 10th would be possible.

This summary will indicate sufficiently the character of the evidence Père le Bachelet has brought together. We have only one criticism of this useful study. Why is the text of the *Æternus ille* not included among the documents, and why in the extract from the Autobiography is there an *hiatus*; one doubtless not affecting the sense, but none the less disconcerting from a scholar's point of view?

2.—LA VENDÉE.¹

It is improbable that in these days of our *entente cordiale* with revolutionary France the sympathy will survive to any great extent for the brave peasants of La Vendée which commonly attached to the record of their struggle when memories of the "Terror" were comparatively fresh. But although it is not likely that many of our generation will entertain much sympathy for those whom they are accustomed to dismiss as bigots and reactionaries, ready to sacrifice all for the sake of their Church and King, there will still be some who can admire the spirit which inspired simple peasants—men and women alike—with a courage which braved battle and massacre and which extorted the admiration even of Napoleon, who declared he would be proud to be a Vendean.

Readers will perhaps not find it easy to understand who precisely was the lady whose narrative is here presented to them, and what exactly was her connection with those of whom she speaks. Born in 1772, her family name was de Donnissan, which she twice changed by marriage, the second time to that by which she is now best known. It was not, however, as might perhaps be supposed, Henri de la Rochejaquelein, Commander-in-Chief of the Vendéans, who became her husband, though he inspired her with unbounded enthusiasm and admiration, but his brother Louis, as staunch a royalist as himself, who, like him, gave his life for the cause, being shot by the Bonapartists during the Hundred Days in 1815. Her first husband, M. de Lescure, was also of heroic mould, and nothing can be more typical or characteristic of him

¹ The Life of Madame de la Rochejaquelein. By the Hon. Mrs. Maxwell Scott. London: Longmans. Pp. vi. 234. Price, 7s. 6d. net. 1911.

and those whom he led than the tale of what occurred in one of their earliest encounters with the revolutionary forces. The Vendéans had received a severe check, losing their celebrated gun, which they christened *Marie-Jeanne*, and to which they attached a kind of miraculous value, believing it to be a sure pledge of victory. Eager to repair their defeat and recover their prize, they prepared for another fight at Fontenay, but so heavy was the fire of the enemy that they would not advance. Thereupon, de Lescure advanced some thirty paces before his men, directly in front of a battery, which was firing volleys of grape, and standing there, took off his hat, shouted "*Vive le Roy*," and then slowly returned to his troops. His clothes were riddled, his boots torn, and his spurs shot away, but he himself was unwounded: "My friends," said he, "you see the 'Blues' do not know how to shoot."

The peasants, fired by such an example, rushed forward, but on their way, encountering a wayside cross, though still under fire, they fell on their knees before it. One of the officers wished to make them get up, but de Lescure interposed, "Allow them to pray," said he, "they will fight none the worse."

The Memoirs are not unknown to English readers, having been published in an English version so long ago as 1826, with the distinction of an introduction by Sir Walter Scott, who formed a high estimate of the writer. They do not pretend to give a complete or connected history of the war, but supply abundant materials to enable us to realize the nature of a contest in which their lively faith was the main resource of the combatants, and while the men went to battle the women prayed, kneeling by the hedges of their lanes or assembling in church to recite the Rosary in common, accompanied by the booming of cannon. When nothing else was left they were ready to die with heroic courage, and this was what finally it all came to, for despite the heroism exhibited, and the gleams of success with which from time to time it was brightened, the sun of La Vendée set in gloom, especially after the disaster at Savenay, and the savage mode of warfare instituted by General Turreau and his *Colonnes Infernales* in their "Promenade" through the unhappy province. Henri de la Rochejaquelein himself fell in an obscure skirmish; de Lescure had previously died of wounds received at

Chollet; one by one the other leaders dropped off, falling in battle, or like Charette, surviving to be executed by the triumphant enemy. But all who study the simple unadorned narrative of their deeds will acknowledge that the fate to which they resolutely exposed themselves, far from detracting from the honour which is their due, does but enhance and confer upon them its supreme distinction.

3.—ANOTHER BOOK ON PRAGMATISM.¹

Recognizing that "the time had come in the pragmatic movement for systematic and detailed application of pragmatic conceptions and methods of specific problems, rather than further discussion of general principles"² it is with some "hesitation" that Mr. Moore decided upon the publication of this little volume. His hesitation was not without ground. It is high time that the pragmatist who is ever insisting upon the necessity of applying truth, should attempt to apply his own truth-theory. The philosophic world is already overstocked with futile attempts to make clear what truth for the pragmatist really means. What we want now is a serious attempt to put in practice pragmatic principles. Perhaps Pragmatism might become intelligible—who knows? if only the pragmatist, instead of talking about how truth *must* work, would show us how it does work by a concrete application of his theory to some of the great problems of the universe—not merely by way of illustration, as James did, but *ex professo* and in detail. The need that this should be done, too, becomes daily more urgent. For, if pragmatism goes on evolving itself in the abstract much longer, it will become more vague and unintelligible than ever, its original meaning getting hopelessly and inextricably mixed up with other theories, more or less metaphysical and more or less evolutionary, to which it is ever being assimilated.

Toward this lamentable result Mr. Moore's book is a noteworthy contribution. Not only does the author

¹ Pragmatism and its Critics. By Addison Webster Moore, Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy in the University of Chicago. Illinois: The University of Chicago Press. Pp. ix, 283. 1910.

² P. vii.

identify pragmatism with evolutionism, but he tacks on to it the *moral* doctrine that conduct demands not only ideals, but also "a conscious participation in the *creation* of these ideals," the *political* doctrine that social organization must be essentially "that of a social democracy as against all forms of hierarchism," and the *theological* doctrine that "God" means, not "an eternally completed, all-inclusive, unmoved, and immovable sum (*sic*) or unity of being," but an "active, working being, engaged in real struggles with real problems."¹

What right Mr. Moore has to father such ethical, political and theological doctrines upon pragmatism, we cannot imagine; but he certainly does so, since he expressly enumerates these among "the important aspects of the issue between pragmatism and its critics." We cannot but think that Mr. Moore has confused the issue here. His conception of pragmatism is as vague and as unsatisfactory as is his understanding of the objections that are brought against it. On no single point connected with pragmatism can we say that we are a whit more clear in our mind after reading *Pragmatism and its Critics* than we were before we read it. Mr. Moore, like other pragmatists, is convinced that reality is really altered by the knowing of it, and yet that pragmatism is not "subjectivism." When he comes to answer objections, however, he whittles down "alteration of *reality*" till it means nothing more than that *knowledge* has always some sort of consequences²—which is not what is disputed. While in dealing with the charge of "subjectivism," he ignores altogether one of the chief grounds of this charge, viz., that the mere "control" of thought-processes by objects is insufficient to render knowledge truly objective, since truth implies, not merely that thought-processes are somehow affected by reality, but that in thought we know reality as it is. Pragmatic arguments are never particularly convincing, but Mr. Moore's arguments are less convincing than usual; and the reader who wishes a clear and intelligible account of pragmatism, would do much better to consult the writings of James or Schiller or Dewey.

¹ P. 22.

² P. 104.

4.—THE LAW OF ACTIONABLE MISREPRESENTATION.¹

So purely technical and professional a work as this would not be suitable for review in this magazine were it not that the learned author, in an Appendix² has discussed the relationship and contrast between the attitudes of the law, general ethics and theological casuistry, on the question of "equivocation." He claims that "the law has risen superior to the mercantile morality of the age, and sometimes also to the careless and lax views of the average non-mercantile citizen, on questions of veracity and good faith."³ With regard to philosophy, Mr. Bower points out that Paley stands supreme as the moral philosopher "on whom reliance is expressly placed by judges and writers on jurisprudence for the elucidation of the principles of the law of misrepresentation."⁴ When we come to deal with "cases of conscience" on the subject of equivocation the author contends that "although it might have been expected that the widest divergence between the two systems would be disclosed": yet,

even here very little substantial discrepancy is to be noted between the actual conclusions of jurisprudence and those of philosophical or theological ethics of the most generally received type, though, the standpoint and attitude being different, the conclusions are occasionally the outcome of different premises.⁵

De Lugo and other theological writers follow the Digest, and therefore differ in the same way as this latter from the English law.⁶ "But there are also certain special and extreme views . . . to which the English law peremptorily refuses its assent." These doctrines are those first

put into clear and definite form by St. Alphonsus de Liguori, a powerful Italian casuist, who, in relation to the duty of veracity and good faith in representation, lays down certain rules which

¹ By George Spencer Bower, K.C. London: Butterworth & Co. Royal 8vo. Pp. xl, 439, [78].

² Pp. 403 *et seq.*

³ P. 407.

⁴ P. 409.

⁵ P. 410.

⁶ Speaking of the Scottish Law, which is also founded on the Digest, the author says: "Where such differences exist [between the English and Scottish Law] it will generally be acknowledged that the Scottish rule is the more logical and just of the two."—*App. D.* § 542, p. 437.

may be reduced to, and are expounded by Cardinal Manning in the form of, six propositions.¹

Of these the one to which Mr. Bower objects is the last in which the Cardinal's words are: "to use words which are true but ambiguous is lawful. This is *restrictio non pure mentalis*, because the words are used without any mental supplement." This rule, says Mr. Bower,

if it is to be understood as Cardinal Manning understands and (to one's amazement) accepts it, betrays an atrocious confusion not only of ideas, but principles, and is utterly repugnant to every sound code of juridical, popular, philosophical, and . . . theological ethics.²

Our author then proceeds to show that "this is *not* the generally accepted doctrine of the best casuists, for it is repudiated by that great Englishman, as well as great divine, Cardinal Newman," from whose *Apologia*,³ Mr. Bower then summarizes what is said on this subject.

That even the slightest deviation from perfect openness and candour needs some *justa causa* is also admitted and insisted upon.

The great contrast between ethical and legal views with regard to misrepresentation, is, that the law only looks to see if the social duty of the speaker towards others has been materially violated, while theology and ethics look rather to the internal obligation of the actor, and also include in their condemnation such deception as would lead to injuries which might have no legal remedy.

With respect to the quotation from Cardinal Manning, we may perhaps be allowed to urge in his defence, that he was writing short explanations of various doctrines which had proved difficulties to his brother-in-law, Robert Wilberforce. We cannot therefore, pass judgment unless we have the full context of the questions raised by this latter. In the present case, however, even from the words of Manning himself, it is clear that he is only dealing with our duty when we are "unlawfully questioned," and may have some duty in maintaining silence.

While, however, we deprecate the severity of our author's words, in so far as they are directed against Cardinal Manning,

¹ P. 411.

² *Ibid.*

³ Pp. 269—282.

we fully agree with him, that such a statement as the one quoted, without any further explanation, is no true exposition of the doctrine defended even by a section of Catholic theologians; but would be repudiated by all worthy of the name. Certainly, Mr. Bower has shown quite an exceptional power of seizing the right principles of our system of moral theology with an accuracy, not only rare in those outside the Church, but even with many who accept her authority without studying such intricate questions.

As to the main substance of Mr. Bower's book, we will content ourselves with one quotation.

It is quite natural, particularly where the opinion or belief is as to a matter involving scientific, mercantile, artistic or professional knowledge, experience or skill, or where the information is said to be that of a person expert in collecting it, to trust to the name and reputation of the individual; indeed, a layman can trust to nothing else.¹

We do not think that we could ask for any further justification for our confidence, that the book under review will fulfil the object which the author had in view.

5.—THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION QUESTION.²

Last year when the scheme of the Educational Settlement Committee was made public, it failed to secure the approval either of the Undenominationalists, the Anglicans, or the Catholics, indeed was rather mercilessly criticized by writers of various colour, the Catholics not excepted. That it did not meet the case of the latter might be the feeling of those best able to judge, but it seemed to us a pity that more recognition was not accorded to the good intentions of this Settlement Committee, especially to those of Professor Sadler, who took the leading part in it, and has showed all through such a thorough-going realization of the character of our position, and such a genuine desire to secure for us what it requires. But neither Professor

¹ P. 50.

² *The Religious Question and Public Education. A critical examination of schemes representing various points of view.* By Athelstan Riley, M.A., Michael E. Sadler, C.B., M.A., and Cyril Jackson, M.A. London: Longmans. Pp. vi. 350. Price, 6s. net. 1911.

Sadler nor his colleagues have given up the hopes of discovering a genuine *Eirenicon*, as is testified (so far as he is concerned) by the volume which, in conjunction with Mr. Athelstan Riley and Mr. Cyril Jackson, of the London County Council, he has just edited and published under the title of *The Religious Question and Public Education*. In this volume is given the text of twelve schemes for a satisfactory settlement, selected out of the hundred or so, which, in response to an invitation from Mr. Athelstan Riley in the *Times* for March 27, 1909, were submitted to the consideration of these three gentlemen. Of the twelve schemes, five come from the Anglican side, two from the Catholic, two from the aggressive Nonconformist, and one from the Jewish side, whilst two may be described as from a neutral and conciliatory standpoint. The Editors append comments to each of the schemes, and also prefix a useful introduction to the whole volume; whilst in three appendices are given (1) the Law with respect to Religious Education; (2) the Law with respect to the Training Colleges; and (3) a list of those who have submitted schemes to the Editors.

It is convenient to have these competing plans brought together in one book, and the comments of the Editors are admirable in calling attention to their specialities, to the advantages they have for the bodies concerned, and to the adverse criticism to which they lay themselves open. On the whole what strikes one in these comments is that their authors should be in accord with us Catholics in regard to so many of the fundamental principles on which in this long fight for our schools we have always insisted. Thus "it is the *teacher* that really matters in religious education, not catechisms and syllabuses" (p. 284), an undoubted truth which must be taken in connection with the recognized fact that the Cowper-Temple Clause "excludes *denominational documents* but not *denominational teaching*," (p. 289.) This means that the supposed protection guaranteed to dissentient consciences by the undenominational form of religious teaching in the Council schools, the form which the Nonconformists wish to impose on all schools receiving public aid, is no protection at all. One of the Editors, it is true, disputes this in the belief that "undenominational teaching given with sincerity and reverence, becomes the expression of the underlying unity

of all real religious observance." But the other two are decidedly on our side.

They feel that there is no safeguard in any system of non-denominational instruction for the realities of religious influence. Some of the teachers (they hold) will have no strong personal convictions: others will have their own views (some Christian, others non-Christian), which will be unconsciously imparted through their teaching. In the case of teachers having no strong personal convictions, there is a danger that their religious teaching will be felt by the children to be unreal; in the case of teachers who are strongly denominational in their religious views, there will be some likelihood of their showing a bias towards some denomination; in the case of teachers who are in principle non-Christian, there will be a bias against Christianity itself. In short (they hold), wherever it can be shown that undenominational teaching is Christian, it is so because its teachers have been brought up in allegiance to some particular form of Christian belief.

The Editors also realize, what so many strangely overlook, namely, that, if by undenominationalism is meant what its advocates hold to be the elements common to all kinds of denominational teaching, it is a measure which must continually change and lessen.

The basis of undenominational religious teaching has been greatly affected during the last forty years by the progress of Biblical criticism. "Simple Bible teaching," to use the expression once in common use, is no longer so easy of attainment by the comparatively unlearned as once appeared to be the case. . . . [And] it is clear that England, though greatly divided in religious belief, is not prepared to accept some diluted form of Christianity as its general religion. On the other hand, it is indisposed to hand over to the secularists or the humanitarian the immense influence of public education.

The Editors, in closing their Introduction, set down "as in their judgment fundamental," seven principles, in every one of which they do but affirm what the Catholic authorities have consistently affirmed. These are, to summarize them, that, if national education is to exercise a sound influence on the character of the pupils, religious (including moral) instruction and training must form part of it; that any religious instruction which purports to be in accordance

with the faith of a particular Church, must be under the control of the spiritual authority of that Church, and not of some secular authority endeavouring to interpret it; that the State must not seek to impose uniformity of religious belief or instruction on all the children in State-aided schools, and hence must not enforce exclusively the doctrines of a particular Church, or undenominational teaching, or, under the name of humanitarianism, of humanitarianism as a substitute for Christian Doctrine; that in schools wholly maintained from public funds no official or financial preference shall ultimately be given to one form of religious instruction over another; that, under needful conditions of educational and hygienic efficiency, there shall be, as at present, a dual system of schools, each sort aided in equal degree by the State, and that as far as desired by parents undenominational and moral instruction shall have the same rights as denominational; that all Educational legislation, to be efficient, must have behind it the united good-will of those, who, while differing in religious conviction, are prepared to co-operate for the efficient training of the rising generation.

Of the separate schemes given in this volume we should judge very much as do the Editors. The Catholic scheme stands out clear,—distinct, practical, and tolerant to all; and as such, commands respect even where it does not obtain approval. The Anglican schemes are marked by the desire to be fair to all, even at the cost of self-sacrifice, but are too complicated to be really workable; the Jewish scheme is well-conceived, and resembles the Catholic, except that it confines itself to the case of the Jews. The two Nonconformist schemes are essentially intolerant and practically come to this, that the undenominational system suits Nonconformists and should therefore be good enough for all others. Of the two neutral ones, that of the Educational Settlement Committee, seems to us personally to be well worthy of consideration as capable if tolerantly administered, of meeting the requirements of most of us, at all events if revised in one or two particulars; at the same time as capable of being used disastrously against us, if administered by an Education Office prepared to take its lead in educational matters from Dr. John Clifford.

We must thank the Editors for this fruit of their labours, and associate ourselves with their trust that this

publication of their schemes "may to some degree further a friendly understanding by showing in a practical way the numbers of factors and considerations which need to be taken into account in any comprehensive re-settlement of the English Education Acts."

6.—PRIMITIVE CATHOLICISM.¹

Although the French original of Mgr. Batiffol's most important work has already been fully noticed in these pages,² we regard it as a duty to give more prominence than under such circumstances would usually be possible to the excellent English translation of the same book which has just been published by Messrs. Longmans. The fact is that Mgr. Batiffol's treatise must undoubtedly be regarded as a controversial asset of quite exceptional value. We only wish that Catholic apologetic had more such vindications, more champions who realized the really important strategic positions, and who looked to the future rather than to the past in their estimate of the need for present action. Here we are indeed in the fighting line. For years past the more discerning on both sides have begun to recognize that the old Anglican controversies, if not actually dead, are at least moribund. No doubt the strongest spiritual influences which are brought to bear upon the rank and file of our countrymen are still due to the pre-eminent earnestness of the Ritualists and the High Church party; but the logic, so far as it exists anywhere within the Establishment, is with the Broad Churchmen, and it is logic that makes itself felt in the end. On the other hand the Broad Church are every day drawing nearer to that mitigated Christianity which for nearly forty years has found its chief exponent on the Continent in Professor Adolf Harnack. For this reason, if for no other, we earnestly recommend to students this attack directed against the very centre of Harnack's position by one whom the Berlin Professor treats with a respect which proves that he regards him as a foe to be counted with, a critic who

¹ By Monsignor Pierre Batiffol. Translated from the Fifth French Edition by Henri L. Brianceau, of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore. London: Longmans. Pp. xxviii. 424. Price 12s. 6d. net. 1911.

² See THE MONTH for December, 1908.

must be answered while other assailants may safely be passed over in silence.

In noticing the English version of a work previously reviewed at length, it is the character of the translation itself which principally calls for remark. The book before us has had the advantage, we understand, of very careful revision since it left the hands of the translator whose name appears on the title-page. It may give our readers an opportunity of judging of the general excellence of the results of this collaboration, as well as furnish some idea of the very vital points of controversy dealt with in the volume, if we quote a passage from the Introduction, written by Mgr. Batiffol for his fifth edition, and replying to the *Entstehung und Entwicklung des Kirchenverfassung*, written by Harnack in defence of his former position :

Professor Harnack reproaches "the Protestant exegetists and historians for their disposition to underestimate the importance of the place held by Peter among the Apostles and in the primitive community ;"¹ but does he not himself underestimate it when he endeavours to explain this place of precedence by the natural qualities which can be ascribed to St. Peter? Again, in the Christian community of the Apostolic age, Professor Harnack finds that there must have been the following elements working—something of the communism of the Quakers and of the "mild pneumatic anarchism," but likewise, as a counterforce, the Jewish spirit of order, of magistracy, of law, which was then all-potent, together with the ideal of the Kingdom of God which was striving for realization. By way of hypothesis, let us suppose that this was so. But Professor Harnack concedes to us that, in addition to the authority of the Old Testament, from which this Jewish spirit was derived, there was potent also "the authority of the words of the Lord," which was the source of the maxims of the Christian life. This is most true, but it is not all ; and Professor Harnack further concedes to us that there was another and last element, "the prerogative of the Twelve and the infallible authority (thanks to the abiding aid of the Holy Spirit) of the community." These were "*the absolute authorities which rigidly limited and curbed the liberty of the individual*," and assured the "conformity" of all. This concession is of capital importance, but we must insist on its going a step further. How could the prerogative of the Twelve have succeeded in securing its own authority as an intermediary between authorities so holy and absolute, had it not been based on a commission emanating from Christ in person ?"²

¹ *Entstehung*, p. 6.

² *Ibid.* p. 18.

³ *Ibid.* Pp. xiv. xv.

The translation, as will be seen from this passage, reads very smoothly. Perhaps it is a result of the dual control alluded to above, that a word which is very intimately connected with the subject of the volume should appear alternately as *charismata* and *charisms*. See for example pp. xviii, 29 and the index—which reminds us that the work possesses what seems to be a full and useful index. How up-to-date, in a literal as well as in a metaphorical sense, this English version is, may be gathered from the fact that Harnack's *Entstehung und Entwicklung* appeared in 1910. The Imprimatur to Mgr. Batiffol's fifth edition with its special introduction is dated March 15th, 1911, and the Imprimatur of the English translation before us bears date, June 1st, 1911.

Short Notices.

MADAME CECILIA, of Streatham Convent, has given social workers another proof of her literary industry by the compilation of a most practical little manual, entitled **Girls' Clubs and Mothers' Meetings** (Burns and Oates, 1s. 6d.). "These simple conferences," to use the writer's words, "are dedicated to the members of the Catholic Women's League," and she further expresses her very great obligation to Miss Flora Kirwan, the well-known authority on girls' clubs, who has been collecting material on this subject for many years. It is to be hoped that Miss Kirwan will not fail to give her own experiences of girls' clubs in another booklet, for, practical and useful as is the present volume, there is still room for fuller development. We would suggest that such a book should deal more with the girls than the clubs, more with the psychology of a young woman's variable character which a club worker must understand through experience to do any real good. In the treatise before us Madame Cecilia seems to have omitted no directions concerning the proper order and discipline for the successful working of a girls' club. She gives rules and games in detail and recommends cards, dancing and plays as being harmless in themselves and forming a counter-attraction to those worldly amusements which pass the bounds of wholesome recreation. A chapter is devoted to mother's meetings and, to aid selection, the outlines of 250 plays are given.

In **Counsels for Young Women** (Sealy, Bryers, and Walker, Dublin, 1s. net.), by an Ursuline nun, there is so much that is good and useful that every mistress should give every maid a copy. This little book has reached its third edition, and merits many more.

In view of the constant multiplications of libels against the Society of Jesus, a notorious specimen of which has lately been made in Germany, Father Coppens, of St. Louis, in his booklet **Who are the Jesuits?** (Herder, 2s.), has been well advised to set forth "a plain, clear, and exact statement of the truth [concerning the Order], which, though very brief, may give the honest enquirer satisfactory and reliable information." This object our author carries out very commendably. His statements are clearness itself,

and his facts are generally well-marshalled and striking. In section 92, for instance, he gives a few but very significant figures to show the working of the Order in the Missouri "Province." Given an open mind on the part of the reader, the book will be sure to impress him favourably, and the busy man will find in it a ready means of gaining a few ideas on a subject much misrepresented; the controversialist, however, on the look-out for points, will probably be proof against the author's amiable and outspoken optimism: a certain amount of sympathy is always necessary for complete understanding.

With regard to a volume of considerable size and considerable importance a **Manuel de Sociologie Catholique : histoire, théorie, pratique** (Lethielleux : 10.00 fr.) by the Rev. Père A. Belliot, O.F.M., we may say that it is on the whole a good and useful book, full of valuable references, and a distinct addition to our sociological literature. It is a deep and philosophic study of modern social conditions from the Catholic standpoint, combining theory with application and putting everything in its proper historical setting. But social conditions rapidly change in these restless times, and the critic is bound to mention that the book is not always up to date. To judge by its references, it seems to have been written some four or five years ago, and its statistics are correspondingly belated. One can hardly expect the conditions of affairs in England to be perfectly grasped; still the advance of Socialism, the deterioration of the Trades Unions, and the effect of the Parliament Bill in readjusting the balance of the constitution, might have been pointed out. It is strange too, that a work like this, produced and published in France, should ignore altogether the splendid and widespread social work of the *Action Populaire* of Reims, and not mention the fate which has overtaken the *Sillon*. On account of its orderly arrangement and the abundance of historical information it contains, the book will be very useful for our social study clubs.

A book of great interest to the pedagogue and all engaged in the work of education, is Mr. Arthur Leach's **Educational Charters and Documents, 598—1909** (Cambridge University Press: 10s. net.). Mr. Leach some years ago published a study of *English Schools at the Time of the Reformation* which gave valuable evidence to show that contrary to common belief they deteriorated in number and quality under the puppet King, Edward VI. The present volume is rather one for reference than for continuous reading, but it is full of interesting glimpses of educational processes from the end of the sixth century to the present day. The author himself in an excellent Preface draws various conclusions from the material he has provided, one of the most evident being that for nearly eleven centuries it was to the Church alone that English folk could look for education, and liberal, all things considered, was the provision made. It is curious to read the charter of "St. Mary's College of Eton," founded in 1440 as a Free Grammar School for twenty-five poor and needy scholars, twenty-five almsmen and a master . . . for "all others whatsoever and wheresoever of our realm of England." The post-Reformation period is represented by very few documents, samples only of common types being provided. The book is the product of expert knowledge, and should do much to correct popular misconceptions.

The rough road to theological learning, at least on the positive side, is being gradually made more level by the labours of many compilers of documents. What the famous Denzinger has done for dogmatic utterances, and Father Kirch for Early Church History, Father Rouët de Journal, S.J., in his **Enchiridion Patristicum** (Herder: 11s. cloth) does for the

Fathers and Ecclesiastical Writers, bringing together in a handy form the chief passages from their writings which illustrate the doctrines of the Church. The work is modelled upon Denzinger, is enriched with every kind of aid to reference, and should surely occupy a place next to the two former on every student's desk. A Latin translation is appended to the Greek citations. Used in conjunction with Bardenhewer's *Patrology* and the other volumes mentioned, this book should do much to show the force of tradition and make the continuity of the Church's teaching more evident than ever.

In the living mystical Body of Christ called the Church there is sympathy between all the parts, triumphant, suffering, and militant. Hence the natural necessity of that *cultus sanctorum*, which the ill-instructed non-Catholic confounds with idolatry, but which only the malice which goes with real bigotry could find fault with, as exemplified in *Among the Blessed* (Longmans : 3s. 6d. net.), the latest addition to the long list of works of edification written by Father Matthew Russell, S.J. The sub-title—*Loving Thoughts about Favourite Saints*—gives more clearly the character of the book. It is no collection of formal panegyrics, but rather devout *causeries* about the author's patrons into which with great literary skill he weaves much that has been said or sung in their honour by friend or foe. The result is that blend of literary with religious interest which is the mark of all Father Russell's writings, and enables one to combine the duty of spiritual reading with the pleasure of training the mind and taste. It will share, we trust, many a *prie-dieu* with *At Home with God*.

No more fitting celebration of the centenary of the great Scots prelate, Bishop Hay, could be imagined than the re-publication of his classical apologetic work, *The Sincere Christian instructed in the Faith of Christ from the Written Word* (Sands : 6s. net.). Bishop Hay was to the Scotland of his time what Challoner was to an earlier English generation, and like Challoner he believed in the efficacy even of the uninspired written word and laboured to spread the Faith by its means. His method of instruction was peculiarly fitted to a public which knew and still believed in its Bible, and of great service to Catholics as showing how their Traditions harmonized with Holy Writ. The present edition, which has been revised and annotated by Canon Stuart, of Edinburgh, is very excellently printed and got up, and forms a useful compendium of Catholic doctrine.

That the holy Bishop's zeal extended to the pastors as well as to the flock is shown by his little treatise *On the Priesthood* (Sands : 1s. 6d. net.), also re-published for his centenary by the same editor. The same familiarity, with Sacred Scripture and skill in its application likewise marks this volume, which is further enriched with quotations from canons and councils, and gives in brief compass a clear picture of the sacerdotal ideal.

In his *Practical Psychology* (Bennett and Co. : 3s. net.), a short treatise of some seventy-five pages of large print, the Rev. I. Gregory Smith, M.A., aims, and only could aim, at giving a popular sketch of a vast subject. In common with many modern thinkers, he ignores Catholic philosophy, making a jump from Aristotle, towards whom he professes a reassuring devotion, to Locke, Grote, Spencer, and the rest. A break of tradition like this does not add to the clearness of his exposition. There is much that is sound and a good deal of freshness in illustration. But there is much that is unsound, as in the veiled materialism of the statement that "perhaps the electric spark may help to span the gulf which yawns between thought and matter" (p. 23), and the implicit denial of the uniqueness of the rational soul

in the remark—"Arbitrary lines of demarcation, . . . for instance between the canine and the human . . . are for man's convenience, not in the nature of things" (p. 17).

The piety of his literary executor continues to enrich our literature with the unpublished work of Francis Thompson, unpublished in the sense of being hidden away in back numbers of magazines. In *Saint John Baptist de la Salle* (Burns and Oates : 2s. net.), the poet in clear and simple prose for the most part, tells the story of the Founder of the Christian Schools and the fortunes of his Institute—that great teaching Society which, recognizing the radical holiness of the work of education, consecrates its members to that and to that alone. It is an inspiring record, because it shows that the best results claimed by "Secularism" can be obtained by a training essentially religious.

Many a pious pagan could have written more truly about the end of earthly life than has the after-Christian, Maurice Maeterlinck, in his booklet, *Death* (Methuen : 3s. 6d. net). As far as the meaning can be grasped through the nebulous style, it constitutes an explicit denial of Christian revelation. What can only be characterized as a supremely silly "puff" on the cover states that the book "may be described as a sort of manual or *Vade Mecum* of a good death, setting forth the most consoling and hopeful views of the Great Mystery that have yet been uttered" (!) To turn away from certain knowledge of judgment to come, which gives death all its meaning, in order to indulge in vague optimistic speculations is calculated to give the same sort of consolation and hope as the traditional ostrich receives when with head buried in the sand it loses sight and thought of the danger that threatens it.

Under the somewhat "French" title *Elevations to the Sacred Heart* (Washbourne : 3s. 6d.), a fellow-priest has translated a volume of the Abbé Felix Anizan's which deals in a fervent yet philosophic fashion with the wonders of the Incarnation and God's purpose in the revelation of this devotion. It is a very practical book for all its rhetoric, tracing the contrast between the ideal and the actual and showing how unselfish love of the Redeemer is the cure for all social ills.

The Life of *St. Anselm of Canterbury* (Sands : 3s. 6d. net), the new volume in the Notre Dame Series of Saints' Lives, is in many respects the most interesting that has yet appeared. There exist abundant materials for the biography and they have been well used to paint an attractive picture of the man who won fame in the diverse fields of speculative philosophy, practical administration and heroic sanctity.

A new edition of Mr. J. W. Taylor's interesting study in Christian origins, called *The Coming of the Saints* (Methuen : 5s. net), should be heartily welcomed, as it deals in a reverential spirit with the history of the early spreading of the faith through parts of Western Europe by the followers of our Lord driven from Palestine after His death. The author has shown remarkable diligence in collecting all the available evidence, and considerable skill in setting it forth in a connected narrative, which throws light upon an obscure but deeply interesting period.

Father Bans' truly Apostolic work for destitute children—the Crusade of Rescue—has been long enough before the public to make an account of its origin and progress very desirable. This "long-felt want" has been supplied by the publication of "*These, My Little Ones*" (Sands and Co., London), which is written anonymously from materials mainly supplied by Father Bans and edited with an Introduction by Father Norman Waugh

of Carlton, Yorks. The Introduction is a valuable historical study of the causes of the poverty which exists to a disproportionate extent amongst Catholics, and of the early charitable efforts that were made to relieve it in the metropolis. The body of the work begins with a general study of Catholic conditions from the beginning of last century. Then in 1859 was founded by some zealous members of St. Vincent de Paul's Society a Home for destitute boys which was the nucleus of the present work. With never-failing interest the story is told of its gradual growth, in spite of immense discouragement and by dint of equally great and often unexpected help. Many dramatic incidents are recorded in the long and heroic struggle which the motto of the work—Never to refuse a genuine case—has entailed: it is a record of the purest exhibition of Catholic philanthropy, and its perusal cannot fail to excite a practical interest in all who realize their Catholic responsibilities.

The constant menace of Socialism continues to call forth a constant series of refutations and counter-assaults on paper. It is right that issue should be taken in the realm of ideas, for it is ideas that make facts possible. But it is still more important that the defence and attack should be on sound lines, viz., those suggested by the immutable principles of Christian morality. Earlier in the year we reviewed **Socialism and the Working-Man** (Gill: 2s. 6d. net) by the Rev. R. Fullerton of Belfast, which was a vigorous polemic, conducted in the *argumentum-ad-hominem* style, calculated to crush but not to persuade. Now another and more scholarly book comes to us from Ireland—**Private Ownership: its basis and equitable conditions** (Gill: 3s. 6d. net) by the Rev. J. Kelleher, who fixes on the one ultimate difference of principle between the present traditional historical scheme of things and the experiment of Socialism. Father Kelleher is admirable both in substance and method. He recognizes to the full the gross iniquities of every sort that flourish under modern social conditions. No Socialist could be more keen to detect or more ruthless in denouncing. But his remedy is—mend, not end. Let private ownership recognize its duties, let social reform recognize the rights of property, let no false ideal of a material earthly paradise be aimed at, but let religion be evoked to soften and give value to the inevitable ills of life—thus and thus only will be brought about that social amelioration which humanity and Christianity alike demand.

The Socialism which Father Kelleher opposes is not of the materialistic anti-religious, free-love brand not now prominent in these lands, but the evolutionary sort which finds favour with intellectual people ill-acquainted with the real standpoint of Christianity. But it is otherwise in America, the land of extremes, and hence in **Socialism: the Nation of Fatherless Children** (Flynn: Boston, \$1. 25), by David Goldstein and Martha Moore Avery, we find a scathing indictment of materialistic Socialism in which the logical consequences of the abolition of private property are traced to their final issue in promiscuity. The book is not literature but journalesque, and American at that, but it contains a valuable collection of authentic utterances of prominent Socialists, which put beyond question the radical antagonism between the extremists and elementary Christian morality.

Under the general title *The Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature*, the University Press is issuing a series of little shilling volumes, some of which have been sent for notice. **The Moral Life and Moral Worth**, by Professor W. R. Sorley, in treating of morality, disregards the constant Catholic tradition and consequently presents a distorted and misleading conception of it. It is strange how anti-Catholic prejudice

causes a procedure in ethics and philosophy which would be regarded as folly in any other branch of learning. We have Plato and Aristotle quoted in abundance, but not a word of that giant intellect St. Thomas, who "baptized" those philosophers, and purified and perfected their work. Professor Sorley has not grasped the Catholic notion of the relations between nature and grace, and misunderstands the character of asceticism all because he thinks nothing good can be found in the stored-up wisdom (constantly corrected and verified) of the Catholic Church.

King Arthur in History and Legend, by Professor Lewis Jones, of Bangor, gives an exhaustive account of the famous British chief, about whom legend has a vast deal more than history. **Greek Tragedy**, by J. T. Sheppard, M.A., is a useful summary of our knowledge of the Athenian drama and an appreciation of its three great exponents. **The Historical Growth of the English Parish Church**, by A. H. Thompson, M.A., shows how wide is the range of the series. It is a clear and interesting description of church-building in England, and calls attention to the fact that with the destruction of the old religion at the Reformation, the art became sterilized. **The Early Religious Poetry of Persia**, by J. H. Moulton, is a praiseworthy attempt by a well-known philologist to open up "the fascinating field of Avestan literature," hitherto "strangely neglected in our country." His Lordship the Bishop of Salford has given Catholics a lead in that matter by his verse translations from the Avesta. They will find in Professor Moulton's booklet further and more detailed guidance in the same field.

Dr. P. W. Joyce, the Irish historian, has collected in a single interesting volume, **The Wonders of Ireland and other Papers** (Longmans: 2s. 6d.), a number of scattered essays, such as form the parega of the scholar, little glimpses into the byeways of history off the main routes of the narrative. That which gives its title to the book is most full of curious information, and should be an inspiration to the modern teller of fairy-tales. But none is devoid of interest, and several, like "Our Three Patron Saints," possess edification as well.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice).

ALTES Y ALABERT, Barcelona.

Los Gremios. By E. Segarra. Pp. 395. Price, 3.50 pes. 1911.

BENETT AND CO.

Practical Psychology. By J. Gregory Smith. Pp. 94. Price, 3s. 1911.

BROWNE AND NOLAN, Dublin.

Summula Philosophiæ Scholasticæ. Vol. III. *Theologia Naturalis*. 2nd Edition.

By Fr. J. S. Hickey, O. Cist. Pp. 236. Price, 2s. net. 1911.

BURNS AND OATES, London.

Wide-Awake Stories. By Mother Mary Salome. Pp. viii, 216. Price, 2s. 6d.

The Life and Labours of St. John Baptist de la Salle. By Francis Thompson.

Pp. viii, 86. Price, 2s. net. 1911. *Girls' Clubs and Mothers' Meetings*. By

Madame Cecilia. Pp. ix, 163. Price, 1s. 6d. net. 1911. *Fresh Flowers for our*

Heavenly Crown. By Very Rev. André Prévot, D.D. Translated by M. D.

Stenson. Pp. xii, 188. Price, 2s. net. 1911.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

King Arthur in History and Legend. By W. Lewis Jones, M.A. Pp. vi, 145.

Price, 1s. net. 1911. *The Moral Life*. By W. R. Sorley, Litt.D. Pp. vii, 147.

Price, 1s. net. 1911. *The Historical Growth of the English Parish Church*.

By A. H. Thompson, M.A. Pp. xii, 142. Price, 1s. net. 1911. *Early*

Religious Poetry of Persia. By J. H. Moulton, M.A. Pp. iv, 170. Price, 1s. net

1911. *Greek Tragedy*. By J. T. Sheppard, M.A. Pp. vi, 160. Price, 1s. net

1911. *The Cambridge Medical History*. Vol. I. With maps. Edited by H.

M. Gwatkin and J. P. Whitney. Pp. xxii, 754. Price, 20s. net. 1911.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY OF IRELAND.

Nine penny pamphlets.

CONSTABLE, London.

A Circuit-Rider's Wife. By Cora Harris. Pp. viii, 307. Price, 6s. 1911.

DUCKWORTH AND CO., London.

The Painters of the School of Ferrara. By E. G. Gardner, M.A. Pp. xv, 267. 1911.

ELLIOT STOCK, London.

The Feast of Christmas. By E. A. Charter. Pp. x, 71. Price, 1s. 6d. net. 1911.

FLYNN, Boston.

Socialism: the Nation of Fatherless Children. By David Goldstein and Martha Avery. New Edition. Pp. viii, 365. Price, \$1.25. 1911.

GILL AND SON, Dublin.

The Catholic Veto and The Irish Bishops. Edited by Rev. Father Fleming. Pp. iv, 71.Price, 6d. 1911. *Socialism of the Working Man.* By R. Fullerton. Pp. 234.Price 2s. 6d. net. 1911. *Private Ownership: its basis and equitable conditions.*

By Rev. J. Kelleher. Pp. xvi, 212. Price, 3s. 6d. net. 1911.

HERDER, London.

Who are the Jesuits? By Charles Coppens, S.J. Pp. viii, 106. Price, (cloth), 2s. net.

KEGAN PAUL AND CO., London.

The Evidence for the Supernatural. By Ivor L. Tuckett, M.A. Pp. 400. 1911

LASLETT AND CO., London.

Heavenly Gifts. Compiled from Newman's writings by W. H. Fowler. Pp. 128.

Price, 1s. 6d. net. 1911.

LETHIELLEUX, Paris.

La Magdalenne. By Jules Imbert. Pp. 110. 1911. *La Vie à l'Ombre du**Clocher.* By Chanoine C. Quievreux. Pp. 174. 1911. *Manuel de Sociologie**Catholique.* By A. Belliot, O.F.M. Pp. viii, 692. Price, 10.00 fr. 1911.*Exercices Spirituels.* Translated from the Spanish Autograph by P. PaulDebuchy, S.J. Pp. 231. Price, 2.50 fr. 1911. *Les Organisations de**Jeunesse à l'Etranger.* By Eugène Bellut. Pp. xvi, 214. Price, 2.50 fr. 1911.*Les Neveux de Tante Delphine.* By A. de Pitteurs. 2nd. édit. Pp. 244.

Price, 2.50 fr. 1911.

LONGMANS AND CO., London.

The Maid of Orleans. By R. H. Benson. Illustrated. Pp. 95. Price, 3s. net.Acting Edition, paper. Price, 6d. net. 1911. *The Wonders of Ireland and**Other Papers.* By P. W. Joyce. Pp. 242. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1911. *Life of**Madame de la Rochejaquelein.* By the Hon. Mrs. Maxwell Scott. Pp. vi, 234.Price, 7s. 6d. net. 1911. *Among the Blessed.* By Rev. Matthew Russell, S.J. Pp.xii, 214. Price, 3s. 6d. net. 1911. *Primitive Catholicism.* By Mgr. P. Batiffol.

Translated from the Fifth French Edition by H. L. Brianceau. Pp. xxviii, 424. Price,

12s. 6d. net. 1911. *When Toddlers was Seven.* By Mrs. Hermann Bosch.

Pp. 231. Price, 3s. net.

METHUEN AND CO., London.

Death. By Maurice Maeterlinck. Translated by A. T. de Mattos. Pp. 115.Price, 3s. 6d. net. 1911. *The Coming of the Saints.* By John W. Taylor.Pp. xvi, 326. Price, 5s. net. 1911. *Wood-Sculpture.* By Alfred Maskell.

Pp. xxxii, 425. Price, 25s. net. 1911.

RAUCH, Innsbruck.

Das Aposteldekret. By K. Six, S.J. Pp. xx, 166. Price, 2.55 m. 1912. *Annus**Liturgicus.* By Michael Gatterer, S.J. 2nd edit. Pp. xxi, 402. Price, 2.90 m.

1912.

ST ANSELM'S SOCIETY.

Spiritistic Phenomena and their Interpretation. By J. Godfrey Raupert. Pp. 67.Price, 1s. net. 1911. *The Rock of Peter.* By M. L. Waller. 1911.

SANDS AND CO., London.

Bishop Hay on the Priesthood. Revised and edited by Very Rev. Canon Stuart. Pp.100. Price, 1s. 6d. net. 1911. *The Sincere Christian Instructed.* By Bishop

Hay, revised by Very Rev. Canon Stuart. Pp. xvi, 576. Price, 6s. net. 1911.

St. Anselm. Pp. ix, 287. Price, 3s. 6d. net. 1911. *Pinafore Tales.* By GladysDavidson. Pp. 104. Price, 2s. 6d. 1911. *These, my Little Ones.* Edited by

the Rev. N. Waugh. Pp. 267. 1911.

SEALY, BRYERS AND WALKER, Dublin.

Counsels for Young Women. By an Ursuline. 3rd Edition. Pp. 200. Price, 1s.

net. 1911.

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL AND CO., London.

A Little Book of Effort. Prepared by F. J. Cross. Pp. xv. Price 1s. net. 1911.

WASHBOURNE, London.

Good Women of Erin. Pp. 119. Price, 2s. 1911. *Elevations to the Sacred**Heart.* From the French of Abbé Felix Anizan. Pp. xxii, 264. Price, 3s. 6d.1911. *The Catholic Diary for 1912.* Price, 1s.

WILDERMANN CO., New York.

Two Editions of the *New Testament.* Douay Version.

SOME FOREIGN REVIEWS.

Summary of Contents.

I.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique (1911.) IV.

- C. Callewaert.*—The Legal Aspect of the early Persecutions of the Christians.
L. Bril.—The Beginnings of Christianity in Sweden.
P. Fournier.—The Decretum of Burchard of Worms.
Ph. Van Isacker.—The Military Intervention in France of Pope Clement VIII.

II.

La Civiltà Cattolica. Nov. 4 and 18.

- The Monument to Dante at Rome.
 Domestic Liberty and Scholastic Neutrality.
 The genesis of Luther's "New Learning."
 Protestant Modernism and Jewish and Mohammedan Modernism.
 On Mgr. Duchesne's Ecclesiastical History.
 The Persecution of the Catholic Church in Russia.
 A National Agitation for freedom of Education.
 The Gospel of St. Matthew and the Biblical Commission.
 Gissae Carducci in his Letters.
 Bellarmine before he was Cardinal.
 Mont St. Michel in Normandy.

III.

Revue Pratique d'Apologétique. Nov. 1 and 15.

- J. Rivière.*—The Catholic Conception of the Atonement.
A. de Poulpiquet.—The Solidarity of the Motives of Credibility from the point of view of Apologetic.

L. Gougaud.—The History of a Soul.

E. Mangelot.—The Eucharist in St. Paul.

Mgr. Baudrillart.—Active Piety, enlightened Piety, loving Piety.

H. Petitot.—Apologetic on the basis of the Doctrine of Immanence.

IV.

Der Katholik.

Vincent Hartl.—On the Reform of the Breviary.

J. Ernst.—St. Cyprian and the Papacy.

The Apostolic Union and the Priest's daily work in the light of the Papal Programme.

J. Schmitt.—The Archbishops of Mainz and their relations with the Holy See.

J. Selbst.—Ecclesiastical Problems of the Hour.

V.

Razon y Fe. November.

L. Murillo.—The "Ciencia Tomista" and the Evolution of Catholic Dogma.

N. Noguer.—Research—Student or Professor?

J. M. March.—A hitherto unknown Manuscript of the *Liber Pontificalis*.

E. Portillo.—Lorenzo Hervás and his writings on Geography.

P. Villada.—The *Osservatore Romano* and *El Imparcial* upon recent Educational Legislation in Spain.

M. del Barrio.—The Synthesis of Radium.

J. M. Ibero.—The Psychological Basis of Aphasia.



American • Ecclesiastical • Review

(A Monthly Periodical for the Clergy)

Theology
Pastorals
Liturgy .

Cum Approbatione Superiorum

Latest Roman Decrees
Reliable Criticisms of
Books



"The AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW . . . in every respect deserves the highest praise. . . ."—*Civiltà Cattolica*, Rome, Italy.

"ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW contains excellent articles, cases of conscience, liturgical questions, etc. The REVIEW will be found suitable to Ireland and England as well as to America."—*The Month*, London, England.

"This splendid REVIEW devoted to ecclesiastical studies."—*Rivista Internazionale*, Rome, Italy.



"The AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, the most varied, perhaps, and most entertaining, and, at the same time, most solidly learned of the periodicals that appeal to priestly readers."—Father Matthew Russell, S.J., in the *Irish Monthly* (Dublin).

"The AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW is one of the most useful periodicals that a priest can purchase; indeed, considering the information given in its pages, it should be found in all priests' libraries."—*Catholic Times*, Liverpool, England.



Two volumes (12 numbers), 15 shillings a year

American Ecclesiastical Review

1305 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. U.S.A.

NEW EDITION.

MANUAL OF PRAYERS FOR YOUTH

EDITED BY

THE REV. JOHN MORRIS, S.J. (1893),

REVISED AND ENLARGED BY

THE REV. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. (1910).

With the Approbation of His Grace the Archbishop of Westminster and His Lordship the Bishop of Southwark.

Thirty-fifth Thousand.

LONDON :

THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY,
69 SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.

Cloth, 276 pp., price 1s. net, post free.

THEORIES OF KNOWLEDGE

ABSOLUTISM
PRAGMATISM
REALISM

BY

LESLIE J. WALKER, S.J. M.A.

Crown 8vo. 736 pp. Price 9s.

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS

"Both (Mr. Bradley) and the leading Pragmatists offer fairly large targets for realist criticism, and Mr. Walker makes some palpable hits. But his book has a special value and importance, not as a refutation of modern theories which are inconsistent with the philosophy of Catholicism, but rather because its author has a sympathetic understanding of modern problems and the attempts which have been made to solve them, and because he seeks to show that even for our current questions the philosophy of Aquinas has an answer, which can be defended on purely philosophical grounds. Mr. Walker is an able and clear writer, with an intimate knowledge of the numerous theories he discusses."—*Manchester Guardian*.

"The most notable thing in Father Walker's *Theories of Knowledge* is its very acute criticism of Pragmatism. That scheme of Philosophy had hardly ever more than a success of popularity; its apparent homage to the 'man in the street' led to its acceptance by those who value that criterion; but, as Father Walker shows, as a philosophy, judged by its own standards, it fails, just because it leaves all metaphysical problems precisely where they were. Father Walker is equally sound, if not quite so original, in his discussion of the Absolutism, implicit in Kant and explicit in Hegel and his followers: and in his defence of Realism as exhibited by Aquinas and Aristotle."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., 39, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

